

AMERICAN SLAVES

By One of Them



A BOOK FOR WORKINGMEN.

The American Engraving Co. Publishers
509 N. DEARBORN ST. CHICAGO.

Entered, according to act of Congress, August, 1894, by The American
Engraving Co., in the Office of the Librarian of Congress at
Washington, D. C. All rights reserved.

AMERICAN SLAVES.

BY

ONE OF THEM.

CHICAGO

THE AMERICAN ENGRAVING COMPANY

PUBLISHERS

1894.

331.8
Am 358

REMOTE STORAGE

AMERICAN SLAVES.

I.

With the great Emancipation Proclamation of Abraham Lincoln finally ratified by the smoke that drifted away from the last gun fired in the Civil War, it was hoped and believed that slavery was ended forever in the United States. But the twenty-nine years of peace that have followed—years musical with the hum of machinery, knit together with the threads of countless industries, wreathed with the sooty breaths of tireless factories, and garlanded with the fruits and grains of prolific harvests—these years of thrift and prosperity have been false to humanity in their results and traitors to the lives that made them bountiful.

These years have, in their combinations of diverse but profitable industries, created out of the American Workman—the American Slave; and to-day he stands up before the world in the disguise of a free-man, but in reality a pitiable, helpless creature, held in degrading captivity by strong but invisible fetters, and subjugated by the very powers he assisted in

14 MAR 47 TALMADGE
Labor & Indus. Rel 14 Nov 46 Kramer

creating and maintaining. The American workman is only in theory a freeman. As a matter of fact, while he is permitted to walk and talk as he pleases, the present and future value of his labors are hypothecated by himself, his body is in pawn, or mortgaged as a chattel for the redemption of his bonds, and the voluntary physical and mental servitude that succeeds ends in most cases only with death.

This bondage is not, as labor agitators assert, the result of the enmity of capital, but only an incident of its exercise. Natural laws require that the rich should scheme to be richer. The Political Scientists of to-day, in direct contrast to those of the ancients, argue, in the words of Dugald Stewart, that "far from considering poverty as an advantage to a State, their great aim is to open new sources of national opulence, and to animate the activity of all classes of the people by a taste for the comforts and accommodations of life."

The Duke of Argyle in his book, "THE REIGN OF LAW" writes: "In all that wide circle of operations which have for their immediate result the getting of wealth, there is a sagacity and cunning in the instincts of labor, and in the love of gain, compared with which all legislative wisdom is ignorance and folly. But the instincts of labor, having for their conscious purpose the acquisition of wealth, are instincts which, under the stimulus and necessities of

modern society, are blind to all other results whatever. They override even the love of life; they silence even the fear of death."

We may reasonably conclude from the operation of Natural Laws that every workman is ambitious and schemes to be richer and to become even a hated capitalist, and that the present detestation of the capitalist as a so-called oppressor is a result of envy as well as proofs of the palpable failure of the workman to succeed in his own ambitions and contrivances to acquire wealth.

The fundamental trouble of the workman is with himself and not with the Capitalist, and results in producing a combination of forces that being originally intended as protections, speedily are transformed into uncompromising enemies, exacting every penalty attached to failure and defeat.

In declaring the American workman to be the American Slave we base the assertion on the fact that however boisterously and defiantly the agitators and leaders may talk, and regardless of all manifestations of aggregated power concentrated in a few irresponsible men, the rank and file of this great army of laborers are bondsmen—slaves of money lenders and politicians; unprotected by the State, uncared for by the church, fought against by woman, half-heartedly befriended by the press, but sympathized with by millions of people who detest slavery in whatever form

it may appear; and if an indictment were to be prepared against the people of this country, it would include these active and passive enemies as principals and accessories to this treason against humanity, this crime against civilization, represented by the enslavement of those who exist by manual labor.

II.

By what right do we dare assert that the workman is the American Slave, and arraign Church, State and Woman as guilty parties in maintaining this condition of servitude? By the right of fact.

Webster defines a slave as—"one who has lost the power of resistance;" and of slavery as—"It may proceed from crimes, captivity, or from *debt*." Of debt, Benjamin Franklin, that philosopher for modern times and modern people, declared: "When you run in debt you give to another power over your liberty."

We do not believe it to be an exaggerated statement that of every one thousand workmen at least seventy-five per cent owe more than they could pay if immediate payment were requested, and that sixty per cent cannot meet obligations as they come due unless by borrowing to obliterate the first. These obligations may be reasonable in every respect. They may be created for a hundred purposes legitimately arising from personal or family needs. Or they may form part and parcel of modest speculative enterprises, and be entered into with the belief, hope and

faith that no trouble will be met in making a prompt settlement. Sincerity of purpose and firmness of resolve are more distinctive characteristics in the workman than in men of professional or mercantile callings. Their sense of honor is not blunted by constant study of how to overreach or undermine their fellow men. They are keenly susceptible to imputations of unfairness or dishonesty and like other good citizens, are influenced not alone by moral considerations but also by fear of the pitiless enforcement of legal penalties against which business men are prepared with infinite resources. There is nothing disgraceful in the workingman being a moral coward where the business man is imperturbable if not brave.

But with this assumption of liabilities, this shouldering of indebtedness, great or small, begins the servitude of the workman, *the birth of the American Slave*. The public may, in anticipation of national disgrace, blindfold its eyes; and the slave himself may deny his condition with all the vehemence of which the American language is capable (and it is an energetic tongue in the employment of adjectives and adverbs), yet, from the moment of the consummation of his borrowing, he becomes a slave, leading, as the days go on, a life of apprehension, and feeling a creeping paralysis of the hopes and expectations that animated him at the beginning.

The workman in debt—and for workman we take the definition of Webster, “any man employed in labor, whether tillage or manufacture”—held down to a limited and precarious income, and soon realizing the uncertainty of his savings, recognizes the tenure of his creditor upon his time, his energies, his actions and, almost, his thoughts, and is forced into shaping his labors for the benefit of his master rather than confining them to the natural requirements of himself or his family. Environed and hampered by money obligation, oftentimes too lightly assumed, and at the outset oblivious of the gravity of his new condition, the workman soon finds that his liberty has stealthily ebbed away, that his time, and the work it enables him to produce are not absolutely his; that another and strange party has an interest in and a pecuniary attachment upon his life, and its fruits.

Once this quiet bondage is recognized the bondman begins to undergo a silent revolution of character. Where he was light hearted he grows moody, despondent, morose, and given to brooding over the contingencies of failure, and to study with bitter feelings any unexpected drain upon his resources. Starting out with an honest purpose, only the man who is or has been in debt knows the gradually increasing and, finally, the tremendous strain upon the mind of one unused to financial liabilities. Let us suppose a workman undertakes to own his own home

and runs in debt for the few hundred dollars necessary to finish his dwelling. He does this when times are good, work plenty, wages remunerative and sickness an unknown and an almost unconsidered element of chance.

Reverse this condition in whole or in part. Suddenly the outgo exceeds the income. How quickly credit draws its purse-strings, and a frown takes the place of a smile on the face of the creditor! Then the food in the house grows less and the slave to debt rubs against Starvation. Sickness may come and parental love be constantly tortured with the dread of suffering and loss. The savings for interest and the little surplus put aside for such comforts as befit a man in his station in life, swiftly disappear. Perhaps this period of tribulation brings death, and its dreadful signal flutters at the door while the curious children of the neighborhood stand around and wait, in stupid amazement, for the coming and the going of the form he held so dear as mother or child. It costs money to live; to die is also an enforced extravagance. As with death so with birth—another mouth to feed, another form to clothe, another life to be nourished and cherished and fought for. The income that never increases is thus burdened with the requirements of new existences, until the sorely buffeted struggler begins to wonder whether disease, or debt, or despair,

is to play the tyrant in this tragic masquerade of life.

Is a man so held down and restrained by obligations to others, so entangled in a web of financial indebtedness, bound, as a spider binds a fly, with tiny threads spun from formidable misfortunes, is such a man bond or free? Can he, dare he do as he pleases? Is he the arbiter of his own destiny? No. It is the debt first, self last. Two penalties are always in his mind—guards over his will—Conscience and Ruin. Conscience is the underlying nettle of human life. Ruin is the bitter fruit of debt. The honest workman knows of no more dreadful scourges than these two compendiums of existence, these two subjugators of ambition and pride.

What is more pitiable in this republican life of ours, supposedly full of Arcadian ease and simplicity, than the unbulletined battles of the debt-burdened workman for an absolute liberty? What more cheerless for human nature than these continual struggles of sanguine men and women to better their condition by discounting the rosy possibilities of the future and pawning for a home, or for the necessities of existence, their right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," transferring to money-lenders and land-speculators their little circle of earth and the fruitfulness thereof?

In these cases, and their numbers are hundreds of thousands, we have the survival of the misfits

in human nature, in the shape of workmen practically in pawn for little city lots, not much larger than a giant's grave, or broad acres over which floats the miasma of failure. In every community these bondsmen to debt live, move and have a being. They live because, while poverty may be looked upon by the wealthy as a crime, it is not, under present laws, a penal offense. That they exist under the constant strain and pressure incident to prolonged mental torture is due, mainly, to the obstinate tenacity of human life in workingmen's bodies rather than to an economical husbanding, by the state, of his available vitality. That he is recognized as a being, a human being, something a little more useful than a horse or a cow, is almost entirely due to the business philanthropy of the sagacious politician who stolidly computes the value of votes deposited by men who would otherwise be marketable only as bundles of bones. A constituency of men without hopes is more important to the office holder than a constituency of hopes without men is to the office seeker. Let us therefore praise with all our might those astute developers of the political economy of 1894 who protect the American Slave, when he votes the right way, with all the thunders of the vocabulary of a ward politician. Let it be understood that no workman is so deeply in debt, so thoroughly a slave, but that he has a value—at elec-

tion time. He is then quotable in political marts; his existence is recognized, and his misfortunes embroidered into those appeals for the rights of workmen which blaze like fireworks until after the count is concluded, and than fall into convenient oblivion, which is the fate of all pyrotechnical works. Perhaps the American Slave, bonded to his eyes with leech-like debts, ought to be grateful for these occasional spasms of hope which for a very little time strengthen his soul, if they do not feed his stomach.

But when these illusions are over and the slave feels once more the fetters of the money-lender, whose croak of "interest" succeeds the cajoling carol of the unwashed diplomat of primaries and polling booths, the slave becomes, or thinks he really is again only a shriveled grain of the industrial harvest, crunched between the upper mill-stone of capital and the under stone of labor, to be pulverized so fine that neither church nor devil have use for him, and the parental state tolerates him only as a necessary evil. Does he weep? His tears fall on sand. Does he pray for aid? His appeals are smothered in a hostile air. His work feels the bitterness of his thoughts and is unconsciously moved to some expression of sorrow or hate. He is honest in his belief that detested capital is fertilizing its enterprises with his energies, and that politicians assiduously poultice him, as an industrial carbuncle, with elastic pledges

of redemption from bondage and with seductive visions of a land and a life whose very worst is the very best of the present. Still he goes on with a hopeless heroism, living through long days of petty miseries and feverishly dreaming and waking through nights of despair. Of course he is only undergoing the grinding process to which all men are subjected who have borrowed money and unexpectedly find that their outgo exceeds their income. But the workman has not the variety of resources nor the elasticity of temperament possessed by those who are termed business men, and, as a result, he soon reaches a condition of mind which makes him honestly believe that the legal rights of others are the wrongs of himself and his co-workers; and as human nature is malevolent, this mentally tortured slave becomes, like all other kinds of slaves, ready for any conspiracy that will give him again the freedom he has bartered away, and secure that revenge against his oppressors to which he thinks his wrongs entitle him. Debt has made him reckless as well as hopeless, and he adds to his burden of life the entanglements of a labor union and gives away about all that is left him of will power and individuality. He becomes only one of a diverse aggregate, and absolutely powerless to help himself in the disposition of his labor. He increases the drain upon his income by assuming the obligations of dues, assessments, strikes and boycotts,

Other men become his masters and direct him when, where and how he shall work; and if he has the temerity to show resistance to commands he at once finds raised against him, in violence even to murder, the hands he has clasped in the brotherhood of a defensive and protective union, that, originating in Philanthropy, has become an adjunct of politics and the plaything or tool of ambitious leaders.

Here, in brief, is given the evolution of the American Slave. No man in chains was ever more tightly bound. This servitude voluntarily undertaken is dangerously widespread and may require an armed insurrection to break it. President Debs, of the American Railway Union, figures that the productive industry of the country is being drained of its profits by the payment of over \$5,000,000 a day in interest, of which over \$200,000,000 per year goes to Europe on account of Debt. "Capital," reasons Mr. Debs, with this tremendous outgo of wealth, and the means of its production in his mind, "Capital insists upon looking upon labor as it did on slavery—that it has no right, like capital, to exact or ask for terms. The principle of slavery is what capital is now insisting on." To which might be added the testimony of the latest government census as to what Debt is doing for people. The figures are for the State of Ohio, and show that there are 27 cities having a population of 8,000 to 100,000, and in these cities 55.95

per cent of the home families hire and 44.05 per cent own their homes. Of the home-owning families 36.26 per cent own with incumbrances, and 63.74 per cent own free of incumbrance. The average rate of interest is 6.85 per cent; average value of each owned and incumbered home, \$2,595; average lien on the same, \$968, and average yearly interest charged on each home, \$66. If these figures show proportionately throughout the Union, the workman has every reason for discontent at his lot, and every motive to free himself.

III.

In most of the discussions of labor troubles and in all the vindictive assaults on capital as the alleged cause of them, and in all the speeches of commiseration evoked by the disturbed condition of the country scarcely a word has been spoken about that portion of the laboring classes called the Farmer. As resonant a note as has been uttered came from the lips of Senator Davis, of Minnesota, when, in a discussion of the Chicago strike, he remarked that 5,000,000 of the people of the United States, or forty-five per cent of the producing population, are farmers.

"If any one class of the community have the right to call themselves, distinctively, 'the people of the United States,'" remarked the Senator, "it is the farmers. Have the farmers asked for the strike? Do they sympathize with it? No. It is the farmer who suffers every day by it. The farmer may always be looked for on the side of law and order, and the perpetuity of popular institutions as against every force of anarchy and oppression." With this speech the Farmer came out of his agricultural obscurity, and

the public suddenly recognized an element in the national affairs which had escaped general attention since the last Presidential election. It is strange that in labor troubles the Farmer is not considered as a workman; yet Webster's definition of the word workman includes "a tiller of the soil." It is a singular omission of so important a factor in public affairs. He enjoys no consideration in large cities and towns where only organized wage-workers are regarded as workmen, and as being the victims of capitalists; and yet his occupation is so important that were his kind of labor to suddenly cease throughout the world, starvation and death would immediately follow such a strike. Will the cessation of any other industry culminate in such disaster? The world has lived and in many countries now lives and will continue to live without houses, and clothes, and other means of locomotion than those derived from animals or by the use of the feet; but without agriculture, and the men who follow it, there would be famine. Yet with all his power as a producer of the absolute necessities of life he has been, as a workman, one of the most powerless creatures on the face of the earth. He is now trying the effect of combination; but, like his brother slave of the manufactory, he has been in the hands of Shylock; yet now, though guilty of no crimes, he has fallen into the net of the Politician. Between the two his moral, legal and industrial identity will be in

all likelihood, squeezed out of him, as cider is pressed from the apple.

For centuries, yes, back to Bible times, poets have, with sensuous delight, portrayed the farmer in such a way as to give him the attributes of a mythical god. His acres have been invoiced as a sort of Paradise. In his outlining hedges have warbled the prima-donna birds of nature; his trees were brilliant with the plumage of others that wanted to but could not sing; in the fruits of his orchards were enclosed the cordials of sensual nature; his meadows were carpeted with flowers of gorgeous hues and exhilarating perfumes; his fields of grain were sung of as golden crowns under the amorous glare of August suns; through his silken tasseled corn-fields breathed, in tuneful whispers, voluptuous winds, laden with songs of abundant harvests; his roof was the star-jeweled sky, his walls the horizons; and his life was depicted as one uninterrupted round of festivities with the elements. Nature was the mistress of this epicure of the ideal. Her kisses were fruits; her embraces became great flocks and bountiful harvests. She wedded her lover with fields and forests, uplands and meadows, with the glory of their verdure, the harmonies of their bird orchestras, the solemn murmurs of their insect life. She whispered in his ear and he heard but laughing brooks and humming streams. She touched his eyes, and he saw the royal panoplies

of ever shifting skies. His days were halcyon and his nights, bridge-ways to heaven. For the old time poet nothing was too good for the farmer, from the days when "Joseph fed his father's flocks" down to a period, not very remote, when poets were plowmen and furrowed thistles instead of rose leaves.

The ideal may be good for the poets; but the practical disillusionizes those whose views of nature are confined to city flower-pots, and their knowledge of farmers to illustrated weeklies and the caricatures on the stage. The realist knows that a thundering knock on the bed-room door, or a spiteful alarm clock, instead of a nightingale, awakens the husband-man in the early morning. To milk the sweet breathed cow no dainty maid goes forth with coquetish eyes, pinky white arms and cheeks, and jauntily tucked up skirts, picturesque with embroideries; her face in smiles and her hair in curls; slippered her tiny feet and clocked her silken hose; ribboned and furbelowed like the typical Chloes and Daphnes on a Dresden vase; her lip puckered with a trill and an arm, set like a bit of coral, in the polished concavity of a milk pail; the grass bending in adoration as she comes, and rising in benediction as she goes, and all nature tremulous with joy at sight of such a beatific vision. No! No! This is not the actual in the farmer's life. Such a belle of the barn-yard could not exist if she would. Instead we have, in the grey,

dull light of morning, Hans, or Peterson or Mike, splashing in great cowhide boots, through grass wet enough to swim in, carrying in one hand a pail of bran mash, in the other a banged-up old pail and under an arm a three legged stool. There is no poesy in his appearance and action; and the milkmaid of song would look, beside him, like a wax doll in a coal mine. The birds do not sing in the orchards, for there is a scarecrow and a gun awaiting their comings; the flowers do not bloom in the hedge rows, and the fruits are not spontaneous eruptions of nature. Grasshoppers poach in the grain fields, and the potato-bugs shimmer in the hot sunshine and carve their way to early graves through showers of sticks and Paris green.

The farmer's plow may glint and gleam through verdant soils, like a running brook of steel; but a farmer's legs grow weary, and his brown and wrinkled face is wet with the dew of honest toil as he guides his flashing bayonet of labor against the rebellious earth. Nature is, for him, only an enemy to be conquered and held in subjection; not a mistress to be wooed and won by whistling, and songs and smiles. There is no poetry in his soul, and the facts that he daily confronts are disheartening enough to make the ordinary workman strike against the Great Spirit that made the earth, and the elements that influence it. The farmer's seeds do not sow themselves; nor does

the stubborn soil unroll itself in ribbony furrows, ready for the dropping of the grain, or the combing of the harrow. If his live-stock is ailing he must know what to do and be able to do it quickly. Practical chemistry is part of his study in husbandry, for he must have a knowledge of fertilizers and of the kinds that must be given to different soils. He must know something of machinery, that he may intelligently use the mechanical aids placed at his disposal by inventive minds. He must be prepared to read the weather signs of nature, and be ready to meet their requirements as to his crops and his stock. He must keep the run of the markets, and be prepared to ship his harvests, or buy cattle from a neighbor, guided by information as to quotations and values. It is expected that he will be up in church work and down in politics, be intelligent enough not to lose his head in the county town, or his person at a county fair. His existence is made up of the sternest of realities. He travels in a tread-mill, hubbed and felloed with agricultural necessities. From sunup to sundown, day after day, week in and week out, he struggles stubbornly against all the adverse elements of earth and air. His head grows bare, his eyes lose their fire; his face becomes seamy and brown, and a stony fixity gets around the corners of his mouth; the hands widen and harden. Under the rigor of his toiling there comes a stoop to his shoulders, a shuf-

fling to his feet and a sway to his body that tells, more eloquently than words, of the struggle he has made and is making in the battle for life. But when the sons abandon their prospective heritage of farm life and seek the cities; and the daughters leave for homes that promise more of culture and ease, and father and mother, grey haired and tottering, are left to bear, alone, the burden of their miseries, then and then only, perhaps the iron will begins to falter and the tough frame to weaken. Then, possibly for the first time, the grandest type of the American workman despairs, seeing nothing ahead of him but the grey shadows of death, while behind him is stretched the panorama of a life sparcely flecked by the sunlight of good fortune.

The agitators of this country, both political and industrial, are fluent in their denunciations of the money power as the oppressor and slave-maker of the workman; but the workman they mean is the laborer of the city, the trade unionist, and those without the union. The hardest worker of all workers, the least protected and by the nature of his employment and his comparative isolation, shut off from combinations, is the farmer. And of all the American Slaves his condition has been the most hopeless and promises soon to be the most abject. We charge that he is a slave because he is always in the grip of the money lender, always in debt for land, or ma-

chinery, or live-stock, and continually in mental torments on account of unpaid principal and past due interest. He is so owned by and subject to monopolists and grain speculators, that he cannot truthfully call his soul his own. To add to the burden of his miserable condition, he is the sport of the elements and the confidence men. Within the last four years he has been used as the cat's-paw of the politician. Let him deny it as strongly as he may, the professional agitator has him by his two ears, and into them, drop by drop, fall the sugared words of hope, the vows of faith, the seductive promises of that Mephistopheles of America, that genius of apostasy, the politician. The farmer has been an honest man in his religious faith and his party creeds; but he is being bid for and bought by the mulleins, the dandelions and the pig-weeds of all parties, and between Debt and the Devil he is retrograding, not advancing. Is he in debt, as a class? Read what the Democrats declared in their national platform of 1892:

"We call the attention of thoughtful Americans to the fact that after thirty years of restrictive taxes against the importation of foreign wealth in exchange for our agricultural surplus, the homes and farms of the country have become burdened with a real estate mortgage debt of over \$2,500,000,000, exclusive of all other form of indebtedness; that in one of the chief agricultural states of the West there appears a

real estate mortgage debt averaging \$165 per capita of the total population, and that similar conditions and tendencies are shown to exist in other agricultural exporting states."

Census statistics of the farm debts of Ohio show that among 100 farm families 27 hire their farms, 21 own them with and 52 without incumbrances. On the owned farms there are liens amounting to \$70,744, 771, or 34.29 per cent of their value; and this debt bears interest at the average rate of 6.68 per cent, or an average interest charge to each family of \$88. Each owned and incumbered farm on the average is worth \$3,829, and is subject to a debt of \$1,313. Corresponding facts for homes are that 54.64 per cent hire and 45.36 own their homes. Of the home owning families 71.02 per cent own free of incumbrance and 28.98 per cent with incumbrance. On owned homes the debt aggregates \$61,145,301, or 37.16 per cent, and bears interest at the rate of 6.63 per cent, so that the annual amount of interest to each home averages \$58. An average debt of \$879 incumbers each home, which has the average value of \$2,366. A gloomy picture is drawn, by a newspaper correspondent, of the New Hampshire farmer in the hill country. He writes that there is no large area of land anywhere under cultivation, and only small herds of cattle. The scattered houses are surrounded by a garden patch, a few acres of corn, a

pasture, with dense woodlands encircling all. "There is no real farming. Each man has his own mouth and a smaller or larger circle of dependent mouths to fill, and he goes at it in a way that lies nearest to his hand; in the way that his father went at it before him, and his grandfather, and his father. The commercial idea of accounting for outgoes and incomings is no part of their mental make-up; they live from field to mouth, and their horizon is bounded by the store which takes their butter and eggs in trade, and the town house where they exercise the rights and functions of American citizens." Debts he must have, but such ways of farming fertilize the money lender if not the land; and when we read that he attends to politics, no difficulty need be experienced in rating him one of the American Slaves whose hide has overgrown his manacles.

Notwithstanding "the demnition, horrid grind" of farm-life, a "grind" beside which the work of the city workman is sport, and in defiance of that incubus, Debt, which fastens itself, like "the old man of the sea," upon the backs of the sturdiest of farmers, there is an incursion of city laborers into the country to engage in agriculture. In Maryland and Maine this sort of a revolution is said to be going on, the adventurers being those who are disgusted with their failure to obtain steady and remunerative employment. These city-tired workers are, presumably, not burdened with

money, and their enterprises in farm life must necessarily be based to a large extent on borrowed money, and the result will be that they, too, will come under the pitiless squeeze of Debt. The trade unionist may declaim against his condition until the world is deafened, but he may always find the farmer just a little worse off than himself as to personal rights. The farmer is swimming in a sea of debt. He is drowning in it; and every labor strike that interferes with the gathering and transportation of his crops and the marketing of his cattle has the same effect as shoving his head under water. Yet he is a good, sturdy, honest workman, a credit to humanity and an honor to the state, slave though he is to money lenders, corporations, monopolists and politicians.

Is the farmer's moral and political strength bid for? Take the latest platforms of the Democratic, Republican, People's and Prohibition parties. Almost every line of them, and "the words between the lines," are promises to pay for his support when delivered. All the chicanery of dishonest intellects is being employed to still further enmesh him by pledges that cannot be redeemed, and by pictures of liberty and prosperity that, under present conditions, cannot be realized. What this farmer slave will do for himself remains to be proven.

IV.

In intimating that labor combinations, or unions as they are generally termed, are slave makers and slave holders, we have no intention of assailing the original purpose, or decrying the possible benefits of these organizations. We know, as the Duke of Argyle puts it, that "when the working class combine for the protection of their own labor against the effects of unrestricted competition, they are simply taking that course which is recommended alike by reason and by experience." Again, he writes: "Nor can there be any greater mistake than to suppose that this course involves necessarily any rebellion against the laws of economic science. Combination is an appeal to the most fundamental of all natural laws—to the law of contrivance—to the power of adjustment—wielding, through Reason and Conscience, the elementary forces of Human Character." But while, theoretically, Combination may promise an approximate adjustment of industrial differences, it has, so far, succeeded in making only initial efforts which were frustrated in their incipency by the imbecile management of the leaders, who, instead of

being judicial in their workings and proceeding with diplomatic slowness and gravity, slapped society in the face with the gauntlet of war, and tried to accomplish by sudden violence results that could only come through slow and tedious legislation. The Duke of Argyle in his *Law in Politics* says that—"all the sources of error which have so long perverted legislation are equally powerful in perverting the aims and in misdirecting the efforts of Voluntary Association. If the upper classes, with all the advantages of leisure, and of culture, and of learning, have been so unable, as we have seen them to be, to measure the effects of the laws they made, how much more must we expect errors and misconceptions of the most grievous kind to beset the actions of those who—through poverty and ignorance, and often through much suffering—have been able to do little more than strike blindly against evils whose pressure they could feel, but whose root and remedy they could neither see nor understand! Accordingly, the history of combination among the working class has, until a very recent period, been a sad history of misdirected effort—of strength put forth only in violence and disorder, and of the virtues of Brotherhood lost in tyrannical suppression of all individual freedom."

The lax enforcement of laws in America, together with a personal license of action of individuals, permissible in no other country, makes the Duke's dec-

laration an emphatic verdict of slavery against members of American Combinations. The English workman knows that he has a government and a firm one; but the workman of America considers, and somewhat reasonably as affairs go, that he is the government; but when he assigns to a leader his individuality and his will power in labor matters he is twice as much a slave as the Englishman; for he abandons much more liberty and accepts a master less sagacious and less consistent, because he is more virulent and less legislative in his methods, and plans for a dictatorship over serfs rather than studies for a generalship with and for equals. The industrial revolts of the last ten years verify the assertion that while the workman has gained some important advantages during that time, the results have come, not as a source of skillful leadership, for none has been shown, but from the sense of justice in the hearts of the masses, a justice requiring justice; while the leaders in such futile displays have been dropped into an ignominious oblivion. Experience has not, however, taught the combinations any lessons in strategy, for they proceed to repeat the actions that made them inglorious in their victories. Perhaps the American workman, if allowed to think and act for himself outside of the decrees of the leaders of combinations, might do well to consider these words of Professor Rogers, a writer on work and wages, who says:

"The English workman has his future now very largely in his own hands. He has only to remember that progress for him lies not in revolution, or even in general strikes, but in persistent insistence; not on paternal but on democratic fraternal legislation, the people becoming the government and obtaining their rights through it." But it should be kept clearly in mind that in this country such "fraternal legislation" cannot be obtained when the people are attacked, even though indirectly, through capital. Public sentiment may be with the spirit of the unions; but it will never countenance or forgive any act infringing upon the rights of property or person. If the members of such combinations choose to abandon their rights as individuals and allow them to be capitalized for the use and behoof of one man, they should not forget that in so doing they also abandon claims to public sympathy, and weaken by acts of violence the amity that is evinced, as a natural law, for the weaker party in any struggle.

V.

When the Lord created man He could not, in His infinite tenderness and mercy, sinful though we might be, have contemplated the evolution of that scourge of civilization, the professional politician. If his progenitor got into the ark it could only have been because Noah was a candidate for some office not named in history, and took this ancestral passenger on trust. If he is an afterthought, a hybrid of the creator, it is not surprising that he has no genealogical record. We know that he exists everywhere, and that while we are trying to make the best of him he is certainly successful in making the worst of us. Honorable businesses we have by the score. The men who conduct them grow in public esteem because they deal uprightly with communities. The dishonest are under the taboo of decent society. When this generation was young, toddling along on legs scarcely strong enough to carry it, the counselors and guides were straightforward, honest men. They schemed, and fought, and died to secure liberty of thought and action. They were animated by no greed of public plunder. Public offices were public

honors; and the men who occupied them possessed such ideal and idyllic patriotism that their virtues were, until a few years ago, transmitted to succeeding generations in spelling books and readers, as well as in the histories of their period. To-day, statesmen in this country are curios, and the memories of old-time patriots survive only in threadbare legends and stale epics. If Washington and his contemporaries were alive, but could not vote, they would be the most friendless lot of antiquities of which it is possible for the mind of man to conceive. Upon the tombstones of all statesmen of the revolutionary era, yes, even down to thirty years ago, ought to be chiseled, as a bitter truism, "Only a back number."

Our miraculous increase in population, the diverse people coming to our shores as paupers or as creatures to be fed by the quasi charity of public work; the multiplication of offices embellished with large salaries; the legislative creation of grants, trusts, subsidies, syndicates, and monopolies; the accouchement of huge corporations, and the awarding of momentous public contracts, with hundreds of little leeches fastening themselves on public bodies and public laws, producing a fermentation of iniquities impossible in other countries, all have resulted in producing a school that is sarcastically termed the school of politics. Man is born, but the politician just happens, being an evolution from the country or city loafer

(an identity but little higher than that of a tadpole), and graduating into a composite so full of the chicaneries of public life as to be inimical to the people and a curse to the country. It is absurd for the workman to denounce the capitalist when at his ear whispers continually the politician, who is more powerful, more dangerous to the masses, more shameless in his capitalizations of votes, than the most bloated bond-holder of the land. You can track the man of wealth. He is too big to be hidden; but the professional politician works, like the burglar, in the dark. Pursuing the nefarious and inscrutable tricks of his trade, he buys, sells and gives away votes. Whose votes? The workman's and nobody else's; for the rich either does not go to the polls, or going, quickly retires from a mart in which, if he has any interest and is working at all, is through brokers. The ballot of the laborer is used, and, with its consolidated power, obtains the controlling influence in the public affairs of wards, villages, towns, counties, states and finally, the nation itself. The pivot on which turns the machinery of our systems of government is suffrage. Votes delivered and to be delivered at primaries, at conventions, and at the polls have now become staple and quoted goods in the political market, and pass current for offices of honor, trust and emolument. The citizen surrenders his ballot and the politician takes the benefit of

it in public office. It is hard to bring an honest man down to a belief in this debauchery of the people's confidence; and no language is vigorous enough to properly express the condemnation that should be given to these hucksters of ballots.

What have the people to say as to public officers? Theoretically a good deal, but practically nothing. They vote at the primaries, but do the primaries select the candidates? What are conventions but combinations of office holders or office-seekers. Nominations are not by the people. Presidents are not created by the masses but by delegates who are in touch with the people only up to a certain point. "Dark horses" in conventions are not the people's candidates. The Senate of the nation is made up of men who are in no sense from the people, and who do not voice the wishes of the public. A large proportion of court judges are lawyers who move heaven and earth, in a political sense, doing all sorts of doubtful work, to secure a place on the bench. The Supreme Court of the land is filled by appointment as a reward, directly or remotely, for political services rendered by somebody. No public place is so high that the mark of the political trickster is not seen on the lintel of the office doorway. Even the army is smirched by the party gifts of positions of honor and pay.

Besides these ever-growing disgraces, the country is

subjected, every four years, to months of unrest, consequent upon party fights for the Presidency. Business is seriously interfered with by the bitter struggle. The news of the daily and weekly journals is made up of at least thirty per cent of untruths about candidates for office, and the platforms on which their claims for the people's ballot are based. We live in a continual and irrepressible insurrection of lies; we are participators in the most gigantic confidence games that ever disgraced humanity; we are unnecessary falsehoods from the day we cast our first vote until the time the last one is dropped into the ballot box; and all this disgrace is incurred in order that men who cannot earn an honest living as other men earn it may grow fat, imperious and insolent by the grace of God, the sufferance of man, and the taxes of millions. It is constantly quoted, as a compliment to our Republican form of government, that we are governed too little. Figure it out once in your own mind how extensive and intricate are the ways of our rulers. Begin with the saloon keeper, end with the President, and compute the intervening rulers who influence the lives and fortunes of citizens.

The more political parties there are the more complicated are the systems for manipulating the public, and the more onerous the penalty we pay for the privilege of citizenship and suffrage. Every party platform breeds discontent in the people, because it

tells them what evils and wrongs they suffer under existing administrations, and demonstrates how a change would benefit the country. If any one considers that our indignation is too hot for this abominable subject and that it is childish to even hint at the prevalent dishonesty and corruption pervading every party, why not take the words of the parties themselves, as solemnly proclaimed in their national platforms of 1892? Let us begin with the declaration of the People's Party, it being, presumably, an expression of the beliefs of a large number of the labor class. This document asserts that—"corruption dominates the ballot box, the legislature, the congress, and touches even the ermine of the bench. The people are demoralized; most of the states have been compelled to isolate the voters at the polling places to prevent universal intimidation or bribery."

If the writers of this plank in the platform did not believe their assertion, then they are liars. If they did believe it, and if the people for whom it was issued believe the charges, and if those to whom it appeals recognize the truthfulness of the statement, then the indictment confirms proportionately the position we have taken.

But there is another new party—the Prohibition—that, having dropped its swaddling clothes, and found its voice, proclaims that—"We arraign the Republican and Democratic parties as false to the standards

reared by their founders; as faithless to the principles of the illustrious leaders of the past to whom they do homage with the lips; as recreant to the higher law, which is as inflexible in political affairs as in personal life, and as no longer embodying the aspirations of the American people, or inviting the confidence of enlightened, progressive patriotism," and concludes with, "The competition of both these parties (Democratic and Republican) for the vote of the slums, and their assiduous courting of the liquor power, and subserviency to the money power, have resulted in placing those powers in the position of practical arbiters of the destinies of the nation."

Meanwhile the old toppers of straight orthodox drinks line themselves up before the people, and the Republicans chant that "the free and honest popular ballot, the just and equal representation of all the people, as well as their just and equal protection under the laws, are the foundation of our republican institution."

To this the Democrats retort: "We warn the people of our common country, jealous for the preservation of their free institutions, that the policy of the federal control of elections, to which the Republican party has commended itself, is fraught with the gravest dangers, scarcely less momentous than would result from a revolution practically establishing monarchy on the ruins of the Republic.

“Such a policy, if sanctioned by law, would mean the dominance of a self-perpetuating oligarchy of office holders, and the party first intrusted with its machinery could be dislodged from power only by an appeal to the reserved right of the people to resist oppression, which is inherent in all self-governing communities.”

What is an honest man to believe in politics when each party accuses the rest of rascality of the worst kind? Are these carpenters of political consciences, these manufacturers of convention morals, these creators and expounders of dogmas in political creeds, to be accepted as leaders? Strip these patriots of their bunting and you have the lean and hungry politicians, smiling oilily in their nakedness, true angle-worms of morality and vile beggars in persistency. They are after votes—nothing else—the votes of workmen. It is strange that the laborer never sees how he is fooled by this clumsy trickery. It is a disgrace to his manhood that instead of thinking for himself he allows these schemers to think and act for him.

When Jones or Smith or Brown promises a candidate one hundred or five hundred or one thousand votes, as is done all the time, and everywhere, what does he mean? He can vote *but once* as matters are now arranged; therefore it follows that he has secured by purchase, or by promises of gifts of a public or

personal character, the balance of his guaranteed support. In other words, he has tied up for delivery just so many votes of workmen. He has bought those votes. There is a price or a pledge given for each. To get them he has inflamed their passions; he has craftily made them dissatisfied with governments as they are, and allures them with pictures of the administrations as they will be under this new order of things. Unreasoning and inconsiderate, the dissatisfied workman forswears his manly individuality, pledges his influence under the rainbow promises of his tempter, becomes a slave to this insatiable plotter and plunderer, to find, at the end, that he has bartered for professional lies that nobility of a true manhood, that grandest attribute of human existence, an irreproachable conscience.

VI.

We have accused Politics of being the debaser, the enslaver, a detestable factor of discontent among the industrial classes. We have no longer statesmen to guide the ignorant or the undecided, but professional politicians, tricksters, who make a business of moulding public sentiment in hundreds of sinister ways and of utilizing the people's resources and remedies for their personal gain. It is idle to urge the dissatisfied to right their wrongs at the polls. They will not or cannot do it. Party leaders have prearranged affairs, as generals plan battles, and ward heelers whip in their followers. Party before manliness is the keystone in the arch of party strength. A party victory means not so much a change of principles as a retention or a change of plunderers. The criminal indifference and political servility of the citizen has much to answer for as to the prevailing corruption in office and the usurpation of public powers for private purposes. Once in a while a dignitary of the Church is moved to remonstrance. Archbishop Ireland, commenting on the disturbed condition of this country, is reported to have said:

"The difficulty is that state and city officials are sometimes so solicitous of political interests and party considerations that they fear to offend, and allow social troubles to grow until repression seems impossible. The need of this country is lofty, disinterested patriotism which forgets all minor allegiances in presence of the general welfare, and has the courage to make all sacrifices that may be needed to uphold this welfare." This is a delicately conservative view of the evil, but entitled to serious consideration when we remember how little the Catholic or any church meddles with politics. The Rev. John H. Barrows, a prominent minister in Chicago, in a sermon on the strike remarked:

"Upon the people is thrust the responsibility of choosing representatives who will make righteous laws and who will righteously execute those laws. This is a duty to our fellow men, to society and to God, who thus calls us into coöperation with himself. When we come to look at the facts we must be ready to acknowledge our personal guilt. Taking our duties to our city as an example of all our political duties, it is grotesque when we come to consider how they are discharged. The prevailing facts with the citizens are indifference and ignorance."

Theoretically the power of the citizen is great; but in practice the politician is the dictator. The citizen does not make the laws nor does he select

the man who does make them. The construction is the mosaic work of the trained school-men of politics, who take great care that the legislators they send shall construct laws which will be so flexible and so porous as to be available for both saint and sinner. The citizen has little or nothing to do with legislation in any shape, or even with selecting his representatives in legislative or judicial bodies. He takes his medicine like a man, and does his spitting afterwards. President Debs, of the American Railway Union, in one of his addresses says: "The ballot box is where we have to unify and strike off the shackles which enslave us all." Mr. Debs did not mean by this to do what must be done to ensure freedom—amputate the politician from the workman; but he did mean to vote at the polls for a new set of task masters, secured, as all others have been obtained, by the perfected machinery of politics.

Who suffers more than the American Slave by this expanding conspiracy of the politician, whose power has become so great as to make him the autocrat of suffrage and the selector of public authorities from a village constable to the chief magistrate of the nation? If the politics of the present day were pure or patriotic in their tendencies, or conserving a good and substantial government, there would be no good cause for this outcry of despair by the *New York Tribune* in its comments on recent congressional

scandals and municipal rascalities: "No reader can rise from these daily disclosures without heaviness of heart. Whatever may be his partisan bias, he must have a sense of humiliation when he reflects upon these evidences of a temporary failure of American ideas and a corresponding discrediting of republican institutions and democratic government. What is there in all these recitals to convince impartial readers that American civilization has not gone wrong and proved to be very much of a failure? We know of no redeeming features except the candor and honesty of the press and the increasing signs of public indignation and revolt against corruption, dishonor and immorality in politics."

The *Northwestern Christian Advocate* says: "Strikes are but one result of privileged monopoly purchased from legislators." Henry George, the single tax advocate and communist, is reported to have said in a Cooper Union speech, that "millionaires made their money by robbery and debauchery, by the purchase of judges and legislators, and now they wanted to preserve it by the bayonets and the arms of the federal troops." The *News* of Indianapolis, Ind., flashes out in an editorial salute to the effect that the United States Senate "no longer represents the people of the United States. It no longer represents the various states of the Union. It is purely an industrial body. There are sugar trust

Senators, planter Senators, silver Senators, coal Senators, iron Senators, collar and cuff Senators, pottery Senators, etc., and they all stand together. The result is that legislation has come to be a sort of compromise between conflicting interests, agreed to by their representatives in Congress. There is no thought of the needs or wishes of the country at large." To the accumulation of such degradations, born in innumerable litters by all parties, new and old, might be added a public measure enacted by the legislature of New York, to prevent vote-buying by making it a penal offense to induce voters not to register or vote. The burden of purchasing votes was a heavy tax on parties; but when they were forced, in addition, to buy men not to vote, the capitalists in suffrage wealth thought it time to begin their strike.

Has it been forgotten, so soon, that the great civil war of 1861 was brought on by the politicians—politicians of the old school, it is true, but modern enough in their tendencies to see, with prophetic eyes, the offices and emoluments of the new confederacy, and diplomatic enough to make treason palatable in the North? The strikes of to-day are the results of the political plottings of party men who recognize in every jolt and jar of industrial labor a chance for party gain and an extension of party power. A greater field of operations is wanted, and a

government ownership of the railroads and telegraph is one of the reforms demanded by the nurses of baby parties and wall-eyed agitators. Allowing that the government could satisfy the public in the management of these complex systems of transit, it would simply place several hundred thousand more offices at the disposal of the politicians. There is danger enough already to the republic in this burden of public patronage, or, to put it more accurately, "party spoils." In 1891 the total number of government employees was 173,435. This included congress, the members of which are wage getters if not wage earners. In 1817 there were only 5,008 office holders, of which 3,056 were in the postal service. From 1883 to 1891 the increase of this class of employees was 39.1 per cent. Let us add the present force at a moderate estimate of 500,000 men for railway and telegraph service, or nearly 700,000 employees. It is not exaggerating their influence to credit each of such employees with the power, on the average, to influence ten men not office holders. This would place at the control of the party leaders seven million of active workers, or more votes by nearly one half than were cast in 1892 by either the Republican or Democratic factions, the Democrats having 5,534,267 and the Republicans 5,175,201 votes. With such an omnivorous horde of office holders, by what possible plan could an adminis-

tration be changed? How could the public be rid of a vampire party with as many mouths as that? The country would be threatened continually with an unlimited monarchy, as no President could have a successor unless he chose, and no ambitious man would so choose.

To support such a retinue of insatiable officials would tax to an extreme all the resources of the general government. The cost for maintaining this government for 1890 was \$352,218,674. The support of state, county and city governments and of public common schools for 1890 drew from public treasuries \$563,736,441, or a per capita tax of \$13.65. The sapient law makers and tax assessors, with a due regard to the wealth of the people, made them pay \$125,000,000 more than the amount needed, and of course drew interest on this overplus. The burden of this taxation, as of all others, fell upon real estate, which composes about 60 per cent of the wealth of the country. As the farmer counts in this computation he can, as an American Slave, comprehend why, under the manipulations of politicians, he gets poorer the richer he grows, and be convinced that, as a heavily burdened workingman, he ought to have more to say about labor agitation and labor laws than the man who, owning nothing, dictates to the law-makers or tries his own hand at law-making.

From this superficial consideration of dominant

power under our form of government, it is astonishing that the laboring man, constantly tricked, threatened or cajoled, by professional politicians, should tamely submit to their rule, and in politics, as in finance, voluntarily enslave himself by an absolute surrender to them of his will and his ballot. It is inconceivable that intelligent men should calmly surrender to a political party their right to think and act for themselves, knowing, as they must, that all measures obnoxious to their interests are conceived and enacted by hostile capital, and nursed to a lusty fruition by the very politicians whom they, the workmen, put in power and keep there. Next to Debt, the American Slave has no more insidious enemy or intolerant task-master than this Mephistopheles of politics, to whom he assigns his freedom of the ballot and for whose benefit placidly waves his right of sturdy rebellion against unprincipled measures and irresponsible men.

VII.

It is generally admitted that the industrial classes of this country have, in immigration, one of the worst evils which labor has to encounter. Political economists, workmen, ministers of the gospel, embryo statesmen, party warriors dented with the raps of scores of battles, all admit the debilitating effect of this influx of foreign labor and foreign idlers. In a recent letter, Mr. George A. Shufeldt, known as a close student of labor questions, writes: "For the last thirty or forty years the policy of our country has been such that labor has been at a higher and better rate than in any other country in the world. Here every man could get double the money he could earn at home. Here were free schools for his children, and homes and bits of land for himself and his family. Here he had no military duty to perform. His time was his own for labor and for profit. Here he became a citizen, a voter, and a politician? He could now open a saloon and become an alderman or a member of the legislature. These great and manifest advantages attracted the surplus population of the whole world. In every family in the old countries in

which a boy grew up, provision was made for sending him to America. With some good we got lots of bad; with the paupers of Ireland we got also the beggars and assassins of Italy, the anarchists of Germany and Bohemia, the Jews of Russia, and, generally, the thugs of Europe. Well, the result was this: We got more labor than we could employ. Those already here wanted to keep the places and the pay, the new comers wanted work and offered to sell their labor cheaper, and so competition was produced. The fact, then, is this: We have taken these people in faster than we could find employment for them and faster than we could educate and assimilate them."

This sort of overfeeding with immigrants has been going on for years. Last year (1893) there was an extraordinary decrease of immigration, principally owing to the cholera in Europe, and the quarantine regulations in connection with this plague. Nevertheless, 439,730 people came to America. Of this horde of mixed races the women amounted to 159,386; 89,577 were under 15 years of age; 311,531 were over 15 and under 40 years old; and 47,622 were over 40. Assuming that they told the truth about their occupations, there were 114,295 who were laborers, presumably men who knew nothing more than how to use their muscles; 209,767 had no occupation; 89,598 had alleged trades and professions; and

34,070 were farmers, presumably peasant laborers. There were returned, under the law, 1,630 people who were convicts, lunatics, paupers, etc.,—2,801 being sent back in 1892, when the total immigration footed up 623,084. Of the immigrants of 1893, 57,897 could not read, 59,582 could not write, and 61,038 could neither read nor write; 10,406 brought \$1.00 over with them and 246,565 brought less than \$100 each. Since 1820 foreign countries have sent to the United States 12,874,876.

These few figures are sufficient to excite ominous apprehensions as to the future of the country under such an influx of undesirable humanity. Note the small number of skilled workmen, and of workmen with professions. Naturally these people would come into immediate competition with those already here; and, of course, by increasing the supply of labor they weaken the price it has been receiving. The 209,767 immigrants without trade or profession came into an overstocked market, and, as a result, contractors were able to secure foreign labor for a much less sum than they had been paying for work in large cities, on railroads, and in mining regions. This difference of competition was very marked, and, of course, greatly to the disadvantage of men who had been in this country for years, and had acquired, by the right of citizenship, the right to remunerative pay.

Foreign farmers we would accept without a murmur if they at once went upon farms and became productive factors of labor. The wealth brought by these people did not make them desirable additions to the country, over a quarter of a million of them bringing less than \$100 each. It is reasonable to assume that the last named class at once sought occupations in large cities, and entered into that bitter conflict for bread and butter which prevails in all municipalities where labor is cheap and the necessities of life dear. This class of labor soon finds out what the prevailing wages are, and they are insanely willing to underbid for employment on a basis of wages that, compared with the wages in their old country, is a princely stipend. They do not have to change their habits of life immediately, and are, on landing, equipped for a hearty fight with men whose mode of living has become through years of industrious citizenship one of comparative luxury. The struggle of these people for employment, being principally in large towns, develops at once a bitter antagonism, a class and race hatred, the immigrant not only turning against his wage-competitor, but, through the politician, who gets him in hand almost as soon as he is landed, there is planted the seeds of a bitter animosity against the men through whose wealth he gains the means of living.

If these shuckings of poverty from the old world

had, immediately after their arrival, been forced to the woods or the prairies, and compelled to assist in tilling some of the unoccupied millions of acres the government holds in waiting for tenants, the results would be of a natural and permanent character. But these adventurers will do nothing of the kind. They come to attack the sources of living of men already here. They gather, like flies, in great labor centers, and, in the market of unskilled labor, present a formidable front, and of their services the employer, a man usually without sentiment, quickly avails himself.

Here we have a labor competition that cannot be adjusted; nor can it adjust itself so long as this great current of human life is turned upon these shores to the detriment of society in general, and the workmen already here in particular. Politicians, shrewd as they are in schemes, and dishonest in pledge and performance as they generally prove to be, are unable to regulate this feature of the labor contest. They want to keep the clay already moulded, but fear to manipulate the new material when it is opposed to what they have, as an enemy to the creature already under their manipulations.

The appeals of intelligent labor, the protests of men lessened in their opportunities of work by these continued and menacing incursions of foreign cheap labor, and the assaults of an alarmed press upon an evil that is overlapping the country with an element

that foments discords and breeds insurrections, at last forced the sentiment-makers of the different political parties to embody in their national platforms expressions against the wholesale admission of foreign labor. The Republicans, in their creed of 1892, dispose of the matter in this one sentence: "We favor the enactment of more stringent laws and regulations for the restriction of criminal, pauper and contract immigration."

In this the party showed its cowardice, for the labor people of the country care very little for the forbidden classes referred to, but do care when over a quarter of a million of the cheapest kind of workmen are annually thrown upon a market in which labor is already overstocked with home material. If there is not work enough for all at fair wages, why do party factions pauperize the industry of the country with an unceasing inflow of raw material to increase that supply and diminish the wages?

The Democratic party is as tenderfooted in this matter as the Republicans. Neither of them has yet dared to come boldly forward and demand a reasonable protection for American labor by restricting that from abroad; both seem fascinated by that glittering tinsel of a sentiment of early times that this country should be the asylum of "exiles for conscience' sake." They know, in their hearts, that all they, the politicians, need of these new comers,

are their votes, and "exiles for conscience' sake" now means anarchists and the breeders of revolutions inimical to the great country in which they find refuge, and where they are not wanted. The Democrats declared in their national convention of 1892, the following:

"We heartily approve all legitimate efforts to prevent the United States from being used as a dumping ground for the known criminals and professional paupers of Europe, and we demand the rigid enforcement of the laws against Chinese immigration or the importation of foreign workmen under contract to degrade American labor and lessen its wages; but we condemn and denounce any and all attempts to restrict the immigration of the industrious and worthy of foreign lands."

This position is incomprehensible. Many dangerous criminals from Europe, paying their way like regular passengers, are landed every week in New York or some other seaport. Unrecognized anarchists, murderers, robbers and even well-to-do professional paupers have no difficulty in effecting a landing. Those who were found out, from their poverty, and sent back, only amounted to a trifle over 2,000.

What danger is there to American laborers from 2,000 people who do not work? None. But there is incalculable wrong to the industrial classes in allowing a quarter of a million of men and women to

come from abroad, and contest with the forces already here, for that subsistence the means of obtaining which are being annually lessened. Why oppose Chinese immigration, when Italy contributed over 72,000 immigrants in 1894—immigrants who come here to work for less money than the native workman demands; who live on bananas and foul air, and who send out of the country all they can earn? Is such a foreigner better or worse than the Chinaman? Is it consistency to exclude one race on account of the slant of their eyes, and admit another because a Cæsar and his Brutus made its progenitors famous?

But the Prohibition party, ambitious to reform the country by attempting to drain the pools of politics without first disinfecting them, has, in its platform for 1892, this idea of reform:—"Foreign immigration has become a burden upon industry, one of the factors in depressing wages and causing discontent; therefore our immigration laws should be revised and strictly enforced. The time of residence for naturalization should be extended, and no naturalized person should be allowed to vote until one year after he becomes a citizen."

Here is the key-note to an absolutely needed regeneration. One of the intolerable causes which lead to the slavery of the American workman is pricked by the lancet of this reform party. The thing to be inferred and feared is, that like all new

reform organizations, having an ambition to better the condition of humanity, this one may grow weak in its purpose, and, as it attains power, bury its initial effort to benefit the workman in the cesspools of its victories.

Whatever happens, this utterance of the Prohibitionists was louder and more to the real issue between home and foreign labor than the resolution adopted by the People's party convention—a resolution not incorporated, however, in the platform. It was to this effect:—"That we condemn the fallacy of protecting American labor under the present system, which opens our ports to the pauper and criminal classes of the world, and crowds out our wage-earners; and we denounce the present ineffective laws against contract labor, and demand the further restriction of undesirable immigration."

Here we have what is supposed to have been the serious expression of the remedial ideas of the four great political divisions of this country. The problem to which they allude is not so perplexing as their leaders would have a person believe. It can be summed up in one question: Do the workmen of this country want two men at half-wages to do the work of one man at full wages? If immigration labor added materially to the productive resources of the country, its unobstructed inflow might be stoically accepted as permitting the existence of an evil that good might

come; but when it weakens the wage-earning possibilities of men already in the field, it would seem to be the duty of Congress to act quickly and energetically in enacting laws which, if not prohibitory, will, in any event, make every foreigner of some real value to the nation. But, as the Cincinnati *Tribune* says,—"Now that the harm has, in a large measure, been wrought, the American people are beginning tardily to recognize the evils that the 'scum of the earth' have brought among them, and the sentiment in favor of rigid restriction of immigration grows apace. But, in the meantime, the poison is at work. The vicious, the ignorant, the depraved, the dangerous imported members of society are with us and are manifesting their presence yearly with more frequency and boldness."

That these immigrants have no strong ties to bind them to the United States, and that they do not honestly renounce their allegiance to their mother land, is shown by their willingness and financial ability to leave the country when it is agitated by labor dissensions. Immediately following the strike of 1894, the foreign steamship companies made their passage rates to Europe ridiculously small, and, as one result, thousands of unemployed foreigners took passage for Europe because, with their savings, they could pay their fares and live there for a time more cheaply than in America. During the month of July

the emigrants from the port of New York alone numbered 19,963, steerage passengers only. Coming into the country, during the same month, were only 11,549 immigrants, from the following countries: 1,928 came from Germany, 2,011 from Russia, 1,727 from Italy, 1,031 from Ireland, 922 from England, 157 from Scotland, 760 from Sweden, 308 from Denmark, 420 from Norway, 790 from Austria, 423 from Hungary, 176 from France, 105 from Portugal, 135 from Finland, and the remainder in small numbers from other countries. No wonder that Mr. Debs, in denouncing the unborn tariff of his party, declared that "while they put a tariff on what it would benefit you to have come in free, they opened the ports and welcomed the riffraff of Europe. They put no tariff on Poles and Dagos. They send to Europe for the foreign element that has pushed American workmen from their once happy homes." When, if ever, quiet is restored here, and they find their money nearly exhausted, these people will once more return to contest with domestic labor for the means of subsistence. If the American workman is in doubt as to the great causes which contribute to the continuance of his bondage, let him give a careful study to immigration statistics and foreign labor puzzles. Then he can comprehend why the fifty-cent a day man of Europe and Asia is in such a hurry to become the dollar and a half a day man of the United States; and how, when

hard times come, the thrifty foreigner, of a few years residence, is able to abandon his temporary home in America and return to his birth-place to excite the envy of friends by his little wealth, and perhaps spend the rest of his life in their midst in the proud position of a retired capitalist.

VIII.

It may be unchivalrous to condemn the participation of woman in the enslavement of the workman; nevertheless she has become a formidable accessory to the creation and maintenance of this bondage, and as such accessory must submit to a discussion of her attitude—which is hostile—and of her acts—which are attacks upon workmen in particular, and upon all men workers in general. There is an unpleasant logic about facts from which shrink even the most callous of natures; and it is not a matter of surprise that sensitive woman repels with abhorrence the slightest intimation that she is in any way to be harshly judged for the part she has been playing, of late, in the drama of existence.

Until within twenty-five or thirty years certain avocations were allotted, almost without opposition, to the fair sex, and men regarded what was left as being theirs by the natural laws of existence; and it was conceded that women should not be compelled to labor in the fields, toil in shops, or perform any of the acts of drudgery which custom had allotted, and rightfully, to men. Woman, poor or rich, had a

special sphere in the world—a round of domestic duties and labors, for which she was fitted by her sex, and which immemorial usage had made, in a manner, sacred. Wife and mother were words and positions in life that made woman a creature to be regarded with pure love, and treated with a loyalty and an adoration which the present generation, from its experience, fails to comprehend.

Why this change, this revolution? Simply because woman has, in business life, forced herself into various occupations, and brought herself down to the vulgar level of vulgar men; because she has stripped herself of the characteristics of love and tenderness which are universally regarded as and conceded to be the insignia of womanhood; because an inappeasable appetite for notoriety, a craze for sensations, and consuming vanity and envy, have metamorphosed her, unsexed her, wrenched her from the pedestal where men had adoringly placed her, and upon which they had fixed their eyes with devotion that has filled the pages of history with stories of chivalrous deeds. Once idols whom man worshiped, they have abandoned their realms and rule and descended to the highways of life to fight against men whose chief object in living is to provide a home and subsistence for their families. It has been a silent but an irresistible and deplorable revolution of sex; and man, not yet absolutely a savage in his

treatment of woman, has had the worst of the fight. He discovers that in all but the most brutal of employments, or in those requiring great strength, he is being forced to contend with the cheap and unsatisfactory labor of women. He recognizes that from the harvest field to the highest grades of the mechanical arts woman, not more skillful in work but much cheaper in wages, is his implacable competitor. Let us scan the list of occupations which women are following. We find them as workers in fields and market gardens; in factories and printing offices; as tailors, in shops, stores, business offices, cigar stands, telephone and telegraph operating rooms, as typewriters and saleswomen, and even in barber and butcher-shops. We note them as lawyers, doctors, architects, ministers, dentists, lecturers, promoters of syndicates and monopolies, board of trade speculators, dabblers in stocks and bonds, corporation officials, and other occupations not strictly pertaining to those of the workingman, but which are, at the same time, evidences of the encroaching selfishness of women and her indifference to and disregard of the absolute necessities of men.

Every woman who enters upon a business that, not many years ago, was accorded to men by right of sex or the heritage of usage, keeps one man out of that sort of work, lessens his field of opportunities,

forces him into the overcrowded ranks of other pursuits, while at the same time she removes herself from the peculiar social position to which nature and custom has assigned her. This industrial conflict of sexes would not be so censurable, nor so adverse to the humanities of life, if women made this incursion a permanent condition of their labor calling. The contrary is, however, the truth. In the majority of cases these usurpations of the avocations of men are caused by an inordinate vanity that stops at nothing in the effort to obtain attractive clothing, fine jewelry, luxuries in food for the body, or the brain, or the eyes, or, more important than all, the attentions of men carried, with dogged pertinacity, to a point that secures a husband. This last ambition gratified, the woman usually retires to the amenities of domestic life, revolutionized as to all the softer attributes of her sex, giving to social and maternal duties the asperities of her business career, and making way for successors who follow a similar round in life with the same purpose, and, generally, with the same results.

It is from such causes that man's fields of labor are being gradually restricted and redistributed, and the value of his compensation reduced by the superabundant and voracious labor of women; and woman herself loses the soft and delicate points of refinement that come with her birth, and becomes an

avaricious, scheming, mercenary creature, hardened to and imitating men's ways and forms of speech, and accepting, with but little shrinking of soul, but with great shrinking of character, a levity of attention that borders too often on looseness.

The position is a perilous one for reputations, no matter how fearlessly it may be met, or how purely, on the woman's part, it may be sustained. She is on territory where she does not rightfully belong; she has appropriated employments that have been originated for and by men, and she holds these acquisitions not so much by ability or qualification as by that cheapness of labor that is, in itself, one of the most demoralizing evils inflicted upon industry. Woman is claiming and seizing upon what she is pleased to term her rights, regardless of the fact that, with her encroachments in the labor fields, for temporary purposes, she opens the way for her sisters, and crowds out of line a family-supporting father or brother. It is true that woman should have employments by which to earn a living when she has neither father, brother nor husband to earn it for her; but they should be womanly means and not the avocations of men; and all the sacredness and refinements of home life should not be abandoned so that, a few years hence, they will be considered as subjects only suitable for the madrigals of poets and the legends of the compilers of histories of the unique and disused habits of society.

This is an age of queer revolutions and grotesque revenges; but it is not the age when women should conspire, and succeed in their conspiracies, to extirpate man because Adam ate the apple given him by seductive Eve. Cheap labor is not confined to the Chinese only. If women would not work unless for the same compensation given to men, then they would not get work. Women consider housework degrading; but is not the degradation of office and shop life worse? Why be the slave of a floorwalker or forewoman rather than the menial, if such must be the term, of "the lady of the house?" In fact, why abandon womanly callings and still try to be a woman?

More women than men are born, and under the present labor conditions the workman's slavery, created by Debt and the politician, is not softened by the cheap labor of woman; and his future certainly does not seem to be stocked with alluring hopefulness; for if to this increase, by natural laws, of these filchers of man labor from a population already on the soil, there is the continual addition of a grosser and more selfish material of the same sex, by immigration, then woman's as well as man's difficulties in the struggle for a livelihood are wofully augmented, and the pangs of her political weakness intensified. What is called the "old world" has been inordinately generous with its useless surplus population, getting

rid of the poorest in order that the best might remain and survive; and transferring to the United States the fundamental evils of labor, the surplusage, to Europe's gain or our detriment. The census of 1890 showed that 30,554,370 women helped to make the total of 62,622,250 souls. Since 1820 and up to 1890 we have had from abroad 2,040,702 women immigrants, of which number 1,724,454 were without trade, profession or occupation. In 1892, 38 per cent of the total incoming, or 236,771 were women; and for 1893, of the total arrivals (439,730), 159,386 were women. They do not journey over the sea on a picnic, for a "constitutional," or for any other purpose than to get a living. And they do get it. But for every winner among this class there is a corresponding loser, male or female, among the workers already here; and as they rise from lower to higher grades of labor new comers from abroad fill the vacant places, and are new materials in the wall that is being built upon the territory of the man-worker. Worse than this, the country has, during recent strikes, been treated to repeated exhibitions of the anti-law-and-order tendencies of many of these foreign women, who have raised their hands in violence against workmen, and shrieked the vilest anathemas upon the law, its officers and those whom these officers were commissioned to protect. Hell may have its finished furies; but in that line this "free and glorious republic" surpasses it.

In this brief consideration of woman in the ranks of labor we have omitted any discussion of her interference in political affairs. Party contests affect the workman more by their enmity to his true interests than by any honest effort to befriend him; and to increase the scope and elements of political aggrandizement is only to add to what we insist are the slavemaking powers of the time. The saddest phase in this self-dethronement of woman from that position of love and reverence in which, for ages, she has been held in all civilized communities, is her participation in matters of suffrage. The greed for power, the lust for office, the itch for notoriety, are beginning the debasement of the womanhood of the nineteenth century. No language has been severe enough in denouncing the abominations of what we are pleased, in this country, to call politics, but which is, in reality, the perpetual perpetration of unpunishable crimes by means of the ballot box. The political history of this country is a record of unpardonable and ineffaceable disgraces, running from the crimes of electoral colleges down to the petty rascalities of township elections; yet, with such a shameful lineage for the ballot box and its patrons, American women come out of the golden glory that has surrounded them and demand a participation in the contests and a share of the spoils. Where is the man so lost to inherent self respect as to advocate the coöperation

of mother, sister, sweetheart or wife with the creatures whose chicaneries allot the simple citizen little else than the privilege of voting? Where women have everything to gain but nothing to lose, in the strife of politics they must take the medicine that men take; but matters are radically different when they have everything to lose and nothing to gain. In Kansas, where pernicious fads are on bills of fare for political meals, the woman suffragists have imitated the men by making a deal for power, offering and promising to support the Populists if the Populists would, in their convention, declare for woman suffrage. A pretty picture, this, for the study of reformers and—women! At the very outset there is bargain, and sale—just like men's ways—and dishonest ones at that.

In commenting on this trade the *Woman's Journal* offers this sillybub argument that "women as well as men, are affiliated with the respective parties by convictions on other questions of public importance. Woman-Suffrage is not the sole question and cannot be made such. Thousands of Democrats and tens of thousands of Republicans are in sympathy with Woman-Suffrage. It would be folly to alienate them."

Kate Field's *Washington* smoothes out the creases in this alliance, with the flatiron of an opinion that these promisers swallowed free coinage of silver, non-

interest-paying bonds, etc., for the sake of getting what should have been obtained without any bargain whatever. They entered that convention as leaders of a non-political cause, and came out of it committed to a third party, in which a majority of Americans have no faith.

The Boston *Journal* touches the subject with a drop of sulphuric acid in saying:

"Perhaps it would seem extreme to describe such bartering of votes as immoral, but at least it throws some light on the character of the reformatory influences which would become operative in our politics with the entrance of women."

But this disease may not spread. Woman is likely to be a queen for this generation, though mighty near an exile. Not quite yet is she a victim of the insanity of political power; and yet there is so much in the old couplet,

When a woman will, she will, depend on't;

But when she won't, she won't, and there's an end on't,
that one must needs wait until she performs that momentous act of "making up her mind."

Outside of this debasing struggle for place and power, which time and politicians will settle for them, we recapitulate these salient points in her economic position—that woman has silently and insidiously usurped many a man's bread-winning occupations, narrowed his line of labor, reduced his possibil-

ities of production and competition, wantonly robbed him of the natural rights of his sex as the head and supporter of a family, and by all these infringements of established rights weakened the state by impairing the working value of an essential component. If there were a scarcity of laborers in the country no objection could reasonably be held against this antagonism of sexes in the various industries; but as our population affords a superabundance of man-labor for all work, light or severe, and as woman is taking away such work from men who have or will have families to support, we declare that the women of this country are, next to the politicians, the worst enemies, thoughtlessly perhaps, of the male workers; and that they are among the slave makers of the United States.

We hold that it is criminally wrong for woman to usurp, on the plea of sex, those sources of livelihood and domestic existence which are man's by right of birth, by usage for thousands of years, by sex adaptation and by the understood law of the State that men shall be considered as the heads, protectors and supporters of families. In contemplating the future for individuals and communities, we are forced to consider the enervating results of creating in young women an insatiable taste for display; an almost shameless craving for notoriety; a demoralizing tendency to an extravagance that may be difficult for a

husband to gratify; a dislike for any of the restraints necessary for a happy domesticity and the judicious conduct of a family; a tireless scheming to marry above her station in life; a flippancy in action; a foolishness in ambition; and, in all, a license in words and manners not at all in consonance with the examples of those ardent, devoted mothers who blessed the homes of olden times and gave as legacies to the world the wisest and best of men as models of what good women can do if they will. But, on the other hand, fill the veins of the coming population of this republic with the composite blood of scores of foreign nations—blood tainted with the corruption incident to centuries of misrule and degradation; transmit to new generations, through the bisexual woman of to-day, and the coming morrows, the idiosyncrasies of her sex and her times, combined with those of men embittered by a sullen hatred of the social economy which they are unconsciously aiding to make detestable, and what sort of people will possess the country a hundred years hence? We shall have an anarchy that will be the real and not the ideal embodiment of all that is horrible, repugnant and atrocious in human nature. We shall then have, not the preparations for the crime, as now, but the crime itself.

IX.

The cause of the origin of the trade union was the purpose of self-protection. The motives were purely philanthropic. As such no man could have good reasons for opposing it. Aggregation of power could accomplish reforms impossible to the individual; but in becoming members of such combinations men did not, except in a legislative way, abandon their personal rights. Is such the case to-day? Are not unions aggressive rather than conservative? Have not the leaders arrogated to themselves a sort of proprietary right in the individual. This will probably be denied, on the ground that the majority rules. But how is it with the large minority? Have they no rights left when the question is a sacrifice of the means of living? Must they become participants in unlawful procedures because a majority decrees opposition to law? Are not such majorities obtained, in general, through the conspiracies of ambitious leaders, rather than by a spontaneous uprising of the members? We do not believe that strikes are in general the result of calm, dispassionate consideration by the members of a federation of labor legislators.

Strikes, as now conducted, are, in principle, acts of war, and, as such, entitled to that profound consideration always given to such grave questions. Some unions will not strike except as a last resort in securing the righting of a wrong for which courts of equity afford no redress; other unions fight at the snap of a walking delegate's thumb and finger, and the members abandon their work without knowing the cause. In such cases who is the tyrant and who is the slave?

Workmen talk glibly about strikes and the good they accomplish. On questions of vital principles of manhood they may and do secure permanent results. Ordinarily they are failures. In England labor is better organized than in this country, and it is organized for self-protection and not for the political advancement of its leaders. Yet the English workman has found out that strikes are failures. According to a communication in the *Westminster Gazette*, there were in Great Britain, in 1892, 692 strikes and eight lockouts, affecting 371,799 persons. Of the 692 strikes 345 were settled either by mutual conciliation or by mediation, 115 by submission of work-people, seventy-nine by the hands being replaced, thirty-three by conciliation and submission, thirteen by conciliation and hands being replaced, twenty-two by submission and hands being replaced, and sixteen by arbitration.

The cost of these struggles to both employers and

employees was enormous. The amount of wages not paid during the period of stoppage is variously estimated at from £485,000 to £495,000 per week. The capital laid idle in 511 establishments making returns was very nearly £19,000,000. The cost of restarting works in the case of forty-five firms was £165,000, and £55,000 was spent by employers in resisting strikes. In 235 strikes the contributions from trades unions to men on strike reached £163,000, this, of course, being only a fraction of the total sum expended in this way. In conclusion the statistician who supplied these says that the general balance of results was against the workmen, as may always be anticipated during a period of declining trade. But there is, it seems, a growing opinion, expressed year by year, both among employers and workmen, in favor of various forms of arbitration and conciliation.

For the cost of the hundreds of silly strikes in this country, those spasmodic attacks of economic colic which are aggravated by an insane idea of giving capital a blow in the face, no approximate figures can be given, and the statistics for such a stupendous outbreak as the railway strike of 1894 can not be obtained until after an adjustment of all the damages to the railroads, and even then it is doubtful whether the various unions would care to state the cost to their members.

The Bradstreet agency, which by reason of its agency resources throughout the country, is well equipped with commercial information on the subject, estimates the losses by the railway strike of 1894, which centered in Chicago, as follows:

United States Government	\$ 1,000,000
Loss in earnings of railroads, Chicago	3,000,000
Loss earnings, other railroads	2,500,000
Loss, destruction railway property	2,500,000
Loss, railway employees' wages	20,000,000
Loss in exports	2,000,000
Loss on fruit crops	2,500,000
Loss to manufacturing companies	7,500,000
Loss to employees	35,000,000
Loss to merchants on quick goods	5,000,000
Total	<u>\$81,000,000</u>

There were other strikes, notably those of the coal miners, which will increase the total cost of this sort of mischief to over \$100,000,000. What the cost has been to trade unions, as unions, and to their individual members, as members, will probably never be known. The only advantage gained is the appointment of a congressional investigating committee to officially formulate public opinion for presentation to a Congress that will show itself absolutely indifferent to the necessities of all concerned. Congress is by no means a labor union, and has no particular interest in the strifes of organized industries; its authorization of the committee referred to was only a spasmodic exhibit of virtue, or, to use a more pertinent simile, it was gooseberry jam for working-men's fingers.

Regardless of the barren results of this gigantic strike, labor is still defiant. Its wounds are not healed. Its wrongs have not been righted, nor will they ever be righted by any such tactics as have been followed thus far in its campaigns. Why labor should be all the time trying by acts and speeches to ruin capital, is the supreme paradox of this century. It reminds one of the old lady who killed the goose that laid the eggs of gold. Any sane person will agree that capital without labor or labor without capital would accomplish nothing. What foolishness, then, to cherish the idea that capital is trying to destroy labor and that labor should retaliate by legitimate and illegitimate means in efforts to wipe out capital. As a matter of fact, every man is a capitalist when he makes his income exceed his outgo. The capitalists of France are its peasantry, who loan it money in hours of need and peril. Many of the capitalists of America are the descendants of peripatetic peddlers, sagacious wood sawers, economical truck gardeners, frugal teamsters, and of avaricious workmen who saved when comrades wasted and played the part of the plethoric ant to the emaciated grasshopper. The wealth-makers of to-day are men, generally, who commenced with nothing but a capital of brain, muscles, ambition and indomitable energy. If workmen are to try and down such people, to extirpate these men and their labor-giving enterprises, then

they are plotting for universal ruin. The *Chicago Tribune* presents the matter in this way:

“The fact is that the contestants on both sides are men, and the money or its equivalent credit, which constitutes capital, is only a means to an end. Capital is actively used by enterprise to employ labor. The antagonism, when it exists, is between Enterprise and Labor, between brain ability and muscular effort, the capital used being introduced for the purpose of rendering the latter effective, for without it labor cannot be set at work.”

And again it says: “It must be remembered that without the man of brains and nerve the capital would not be employed, and no workman would be hired, and no wages paid, and the industry would not be carried on.

“The capital thus put in use is the profit and saving of past labor that has been conducted by Enterprise. It is owned by somebody who is willing to take rent for its use without himself actively supervising the process or taking part in the industrial labor. If a man uses his own money, land, buildings, raw material or machinery in productive process it is part of his Enterprise. If he borrows from another the use of part or all of these he bargains for the use of that capital, for which he agrees to pay rent or interest, expecting to do so out of the profits of the business. He does not hire the capi-

talist, but hires the property or money of the capitalist.

“Hence in a strike, lockout, boycott, or other industrial disturbance the strife or struggle is not between ‘capital and labor.’ The capitalist is not lifting a finger unless as he sometimes may occupy the position of a stock-holder, threatened with loss of some of his capital. The contest is left to the men of enterprise and the men whom they have hired at commercial wages to assist in certain processes of reproduction or transportation. Neither the banker who handles enterprise money nor the owner of the deposits which are loaned out by the banker, goes to work in the shops, bosses the men, or attends to marketing the product. The real combat is, therefore, between the men with brains, who borrow the capital, and the men with muscle who are hired to work up the raw materials by the aid of machinery into more valuable forms.

“If the workers cripple or break down the enterprising man who employs them by the aid of borrowed capital, in what way do they benefit themselves by killing his business? If the enterprising man whose brains have directed their efforts becomes discouraged, even without being badly crippled, he turns over the capital on hand to the capitalist from whom he hired it, discharges the men who have struck against him, and steps back into inactivity. If he

has lost a part of the capital before giving up to the strikers, he hands over the remainder to those to whom it belongs, the machinery, buildings, and land become unproductive, the concern is closed up, and the 500 or 1,000 men who had been getting wages from the man with enterprising brains are turned adrift, having knocked themselves out of their jobs by their folly."

From such a presentation of the attitude of enterprise, not capital, and labor, one would reasonably infer that by a strike as against capital the workman was simply trying to kick off his own head. But the English anarchist, Mr. Charles Wilfred Mowbray, who has come to this country to sprinkle our institutions with the gasoline of his ideas and then set fire to the results, in a speech in New York city just after his arrival changed the war-cry just a little, declaring, among other things: "It has been said that we want to do away with capital. That's ridiculous, false. Capital is the result of labor. It does not grow in a garden; it is not rained from heaven as it is said was the manna to the children of Israel. What we do want is not to do away with capital, but to do away with the capitalist.

* * * * *

"I mean by doing away with the capitalist, putting them to the severest punishment they could endure, making them work for an honest living. Labor

unions of to-day are gradually being forced into the ranks of Anarchist Communists. A strike cannot any more be used to better the condition of the workmen. Consequently while organizing they are studying the doctrine that the Socialists, the Communists, and the Anarchists lay before them. It will be impossible for those men not to fight, not to take a rifle, a knife, or a bomb, to revolutionize society by folding their arms."

It is well to know what the anarchists are hoping, working, but not praying for, prayer being, presumably, not of their arsenal of weapons. Perhaps it is not fair to assert this, because we are told by the Associated Press that a prominent minister of the gospel, of Denver, Col., delivered an address before a large audience of railway men in which he said: "Jesus Christ was not only an Anarchist, but was killed by the representatives of the law, the church, and state for daring to practice humanity. Jesus Christ was an Anarchist and a Socialist, but I never read of his being a Deputy Sheriff."

This sentiment being received with "cheers," the reverend gentleman ought to have urged his hearers to enlist with the devil, because his Satanic majesty had boycotted the Creator. But he omitted that natural sequence to his blasphemy, and concluded his oration by remarking:

"I also say that a man who does not belong to a

union and stands ready to take another man's place at less wages is an enemy, a spy, and an obstructor, and ought in some peaceable way to be removed."

Forgetting that "peaceable removals" have cost many human lives.

Have the laborers of the country forgotten the words of wisdom embodied in President Lincoln's message to Congress in December, 1861, and repeated by him to a committee of workmen who had called upon him? His message contained many great things, but among them were ideas more pertinent now than then. He said:

"Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights which are as worthy of protection as any other rights. Nor is it denied that there is and probably always will be a relation between capital and labor producing mutual benefits. The error is in assuming that the whole labor of a community exists within that relation. A few men own capital and that few avoid labor themselves, and with their capital hire or buy another few to labor for them. A large majority belong to neither class; neither work for others nor have others working for them. In the most of the Southern States a majority of the whole people, of all colors, are neither slaves

nor masters; while in the Northern a large majority are neither hirers nor hired. Men with their families—wives, sons, and daughters—work for themselves on their farms, in their houses, and in their shops, taking the whole product to themselves, and asking no favors of capital on the one hand, nor of hired laborers or slaves on the other. It is not forgotten that a considerable number of persons mingle their own labor with capital; that is, they labor with their own hands and also buy or hire others to labor for them; but this is only a mixed and not a distinct class. No principle stated is disturbed by the existence of this mixed class.

“Again, as has already been said, there is not of necessity any such thing as the free hired laborer being fixed to that condition for life. Many independent men everywhere in these States a few years back in their lives were hired laborers. The prudent peniless beginner in the world labors for wages a while, saves a surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account another while, and at length hires another new beginner to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all—gives hope to all, and consequent energy and progress, and improvement of condition to all. No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty—none less inclined to touch or take

aught which they have not honestly earned. Let them beware of surrendering a political power they already possess, and which, if surrendered, will surely be used to close the door of advancement against such as they, and to fix new disabilities and burdens upon them till all of liberty shall be lost."

To the committee he added that: "The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside of the family relation, should be one uniting all working people of all nations, and tongues and kindreds. Nor should this lead to a war upon property or the owners of property. Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him labor diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

Have men, labor, capital, the enterprise which uses it, changed greatly within thirty-three years? Is not Mr. Lincoln's sermon as timely and as true now as then?

But if the pernicious agitators who help to create and maintain the present system of American slavery are determined to hold capitalists and not monopolists to an accountability for labor servitude, let them read what Mr. Joseph Gruenhut, a noted student of

industrial problems, has to say about capital and labor: "Capitalists, under our present conditions, appropriate the greater proportion of the productive wealth of the business community, and are secured by law and public sentiment in their means and opportunities of further acquisition. Capital is needed for the employment and compensation of the workers; its increase under control of able managers is therefore a gain to the whole people. Capitalists lead industrial progress at their own individual risk, losing by obsolete machinery, and depreciated stock, while supporting the working people during the industrial transformation. Consolidated capital is an international leveler, and overcomes all sorts of prejudices which in former times obstructed the course of trade. Industrial pioneers in the extension of trade and labor earn the gratitude of mankind, while they hardly ever gain a profit from the start of a new industrial departure. The capitalist employer is the ally of the workers; by his management inventions are turned to the best account, industry is made more productive, and the best markets are reached.

"Capitalists, on the whole, are cheapening goods and increasing the purchasing powers of wages, and thus improving the common average standard of living. They are coöperating in such numbers and with such massed financial strength as to enable them to undertake vast international enterprises to

equalize the bounties of civilization among all people. Labor is dependent for its efficiency on capital employed in production, and earns more compensation with increased investments of capital in business of all sorts. The wage-workers benefit not only by any cause which renders their own labor more efficient in producing commodities, but by whatever makes that labor more efficient which produces any and all necessary articles for use and consumption.

"The demand for any particular kind of labor depends (1) on its value in use, (2) on the purchaser's power to pay for it. New articles are continually brought to market and introduced for consumption; the diversity of employment continually increases. A rising standard of living is the result of improved methods of production and fair system of exchanges. Sound public policy requires that no trade should be underpaid or overpaid, and that the mere necessities of life should not be raised in price by indirect taxation. Social progress tends to fairly distribute labor and leisure and the means of living among an ever-increasing proportion of the whole people. Any destructive, obstructive, or extortionate and plundering practices in business affairs should be remediable by legal regulations, and reliable statistics on trade and labor should be gathered for public information."

Enough has been written to show that as between plain capital, as used in business, and plain labor as

employed by capital, there should be no hostility, because they are inter-dependent. Any individual oppression is not a cause for general antagonism. Wealth consolidated in a monopoly, in a robber-syndicate, in a trust that is against public policy, in any combination that takes everything and gives nothing—these are the enemies that workmen should attack and eradicate. They are the enemies of human comfort, peace and happiness. The slave of unions must emancipate himself not only from his slavery to unwisely given bonds and promises, but from the rule of unwise leaders. He must change his ideas and his plan of action if he would be free. As it is, with every strike he adds a link to his chains, and with every boycott he commits a crime against himself and against the society in which he lives and under whose laws he finds protection. And right here it is well to disabuse many vociferous orators, and even a large number of workmen, of the opinion that, because a man has joined a trade union, and gets wages, he thereby acquires an exclusive franchise to the title of "workman." The claim is an absurd one. It is as the *Louisville Courier Journal* says:—"Every man who works for a living is a workingman. Yet there are undoubtedly degrees among workingmen. There is the workingman who by his capacity and application has lifted himself out of weekly wages into an annual salary. There is the workingman

who hopes to do this and is striving to do it. Then there is the man who neither hopes nor cares to do it, but who glories in being a poor devil, preferring to drag down others than to try to raise himself."

The right of way for individual lives is not surveyed and charted by political and labor agitators, but by the alleged representatives of the people. These representatives are not patriots except by implication. The patriot has become a rare if not an extinct bird. In peace he is an incident, as the hero is an accident, of the time. Self is the adjusting weight of the public as well as the private acts of individuals. Patriotism and three-dollars-a-day wages are in harmony, just as despair and ten dollars a month in the army are compatible. Between law makers and law breakers the only difference is the law. The good citizen takes his medicine, no matter what the label says, because it is prescribed for him; but he changes doctors as soon as he can if the medicine harms him. If laws are made for monopolists and corporations the workman can change matters in a legitimate way by acting for himself and by himself, instead of by a proxy of dubious reputation. We believe that labor unions are for enforcing justice, and not for inflicting injustice. Strikes right no wrongs, but wrong many rights. Look at the question in the light thrown upon it by the *Louisville Courier Journal*:

"Fifty millions of Americans are neither rich nor poor. Fifty millions work to earn their bread, some for high wages and some for low wages, some in one way and some in another way, but all do actually work for a living. Are these plain, honest people, who go hand in hand through life as neighbors and friends, whose children attend the same schools, whose families pray together and play together, who salute the same flag and serve the same God, are they to be rent asunder, instructed in divergent interests, and taught to hate one another at the bidding of some chance leader or upstart agitator seeking to exploit himself?"

Bad leadership is infinitely worse than no leadership, in peace as in war. The *Evening Post*, of New York City, puts a finger on a rot spot when it asserts that—"Laboring men are proving the economists to be correct in magnifying the importance of the manager in all large enterprises. A man who can win success for a corporation is worthy of a larger share in the common rewards. It is rare to find among the trades-union leaders that executive ability which takes particular note of general trade conditions as well as of local requirements. The conspicuous lack in the labor combinations from a business point of view is good leadership. Workingmen could better afford to pay some real leader—who need not be a laboring man—a large salary than go on a strike for

six weeks and face starvation only to find defeat inevitable at the end."

And the Springfield (Mass.) *Republican* asks: "If we admit that the strike is doomed to annihilation, as it seems to be, are we prepared to grant to the wage-earners something in its place? If we are optimistic, we must be content with the faith that the forces now working so mysteriously will lead to a higher industrial state where there will be no strikes."

Of strikes and their effects Archbishop Ireland of St. Paul, Minn., one of the most distinguished prelates of the Roman Catholic Church, in commenting on labor troubles, said that—"The fatal mistake which has been made in connection with this strike is that property has been destroyed, the liberty of citizens interfered with, human lives endangered, social order menaced, and the institutions and freedom of the country put in most serious jeopardy. The moment such things happen, all possible questions as to the rights and grievances of labor must be dropped out of sight and all efforts of law-abiding citizens and of public officials made to serve in maintaining public order and guarding at all costs the public weal. Labor must learn that, however sacred its rights be, there is something above them and absolutely supreme—social order and the laws of public justice. There is no civil crime as hideous and as pregnant of evil results as resistance to law and the constitu-

tional authorities of the country. This resistance is revolution; it begets chaos; it is anarchy; it disrupts the whole social fabric which insures life and safety to the poor as well as to the rich, to the employee as well as to the employer.

"There can be no hesitation to bring in the help of the repressive powers of society when property is menaced. Only savages, or men who for the time being are turned into savages, will burn or destroy property, whether it be the factory of the rich man or the poor man's cottage, a railroad car or a national building. More criminal and more inexcusable yet is the act of murdering human beings or of endangering their lives. Labor, too, must learn the lesson that the liberty of the citizen is to be respected. One man has the right to cease from work, but he has no right to drive another man from work. He who respects not the liberty of others shows himself unworthy of his own liberty and incapable of citizenship in a free country. Never can riots and mob rule and lawless depredation be tolerated. The country that permits them signs its death warrant."

And in the same interview he added: "As to strikes, I repeat the words of a labor leader, T. V. Powderly, 'they are nearly always failures, and should scarcely ever be resorted to, even when most securely guarded from wrong doing.' The workman, even when he apparently gains his purpose, finds on com-

putation that he has suffered severe financial losses, and has weakened his chances for future employment. Besides, strikes affect the great public of America as well as the employer, and workmen should consider the rights of this public, whose moral support, moreover, the cause of labor sorely needs.

“For my own part, I believe the large number of men who join strikes are more to be pitied than blamed. They are led on by irresponsible and tyrannous chiefs. Labor unions have great value, but one marked evil in them is that they put the liberties of tens of thousands in the keeping of one man, or of a few who become their absolute masters, their despotic czars.”

As for that most insane of crazy acts, the “sympathetic strike,” resorted to by leaders more to show their power than to express or win sympathy, Governor Jones, of Alabama, in his official proclamation declared that—“Railways are but public highways, and those who own and those who operate them are trustees to keep them open for the public good. They have become the great arteries of our prosperity, are essential to our very existence, and enter into the daily life of the citizen and influence his welfare and destiny in innumerable ways. Any class of men who can sit astride of these great highways and arbitrarily determine when they shall be closed to the public becomes the master of the citizen, and

the citizen in turn becomes their slave. They can practically dictate what he shall eat and what he shall wear, when he shall not labor, and the reward when it is permitted him to work, and where he may go, and hold his liberties in a vise. No brave or free people have ever permitted any class to exercise such despotism over themselves, their pursuits, and their prosperity, and it is trifling with the peace and happiness of the people for any set of men to attempt it."

Ex-Governor Horace Boies, of Iowa, spoke out loud when he asserted that—"The sympathetic strike must go or the unions that engage in it will be destroyed, and with it must go forever the scenes of riot and carnage that have characterized so many recent strikes, or the organizations responsible for them will be ground into dust under the iron heel of an awakened public sentiment that will never consent to see the laws that are absolutely essential for the protection of life and liberty openly and flagrantly violated, and thereby the existence of our institutions put in jeopardy."

Strikes are the great problems of the day. We have given the opinions of eminent people and of recognized exponents of the law-abiding public; but no solution is given of these problems, which are, in effect, tests of the republic's form of government, and of its ability to meet great forces of its citizens practically arrayed against it in the form of war.

This insurrectionary attitude brought from Herbert Spencer this opinion: "My faith in free institutions, originally strong (though always joined with the belief that the maintenance and success of them is a question of popular character), has in these later years been greatly decreased by the conviction that the fit character is not possessed by any people, nor is likely to be possessed for ages to come. A nation of which the legislators vote as they are bid, and of which the workers surrender their rights of selling their labor as they please, has neither the ideas nor the sentiments needed for the maintenance of liberty. Lacking them, we are on the way back to the rule of the strong hand in the shape of the bureaucratic despotism of a socialistic organization, and then of the military despotism which must follow it; if, indeed, some social crash does not bring this last upon us more quickly."

But whatever reforms may follow these hostile demonstrations, and whatever harmonious amity may be established between the poor and the rich whereby the lion may safely lie down beside the lamb, there will probably still remain undelivered the American Slave, whose liberty is not in the enactment and enforcement of laws, but in the exercise of his own will-power for self-emancipation from hostile conditions legally originated and lawfully maintained.

X.

If an indictment were to be framed against the Church it would be to hold it, not as a principal, but as an accessory to the crime (for it is a crime against humanity if not against the law) of maintaining by example, by doctrine and by prayer, that system of American Slavery which is originated in Debt, fostered by politics, and utilized by those tyrants of wealth who, by their abuse of fortune, inflame the passions of workmen and endanger the stability of the Republic. This may look like a serious accusation to bring against a mass of people—millions of them—who, during a few hours of one day in each week conform to their manuals of creeds and are drilled in the tactics of saints for conflicts with sin; but dogmas, no matter how eloquently propounded, fail to supply the stomach with food and the disheartened with hope. It is the real, more than the spiritual, which perplexes the ordinary man, because he is constantly contending with the grim, unmistakable facts of the present, while the hereafter is an insoluble mystery; and in this real life he wants only advice and solace for the actual dangers with

which his peace of mind and the welfare of his family are menaced.

Can the American Slave, envious of the wealth of others, with his actual liberty imperiled by the rapacity of monopolies and the arrogance of corporations, and with his mind always in a condition of apprehension of ambuscades and surprises, can this man appeal to the Church for that tender and invigorating consolation which comes from the unsinning in deed and the just in purpose? Why, the Church is, in itself, the most eloquent and extraordinary example in human history of the pernicious power and degrading effect of enormous wealth in the toils of a still more enormous debt. America bristles, like the "fretful porcupine," with the cross-tipped domes, spires, steeples, and towers of buildings wherein the pulpit is for the Lord and the mortgagor holds the rest. What warning against Debt is given to Labor by the sanctuaries of Jehovah, temples that should be as unsoiled by lust and lucre as the solemn sky to which they point; edifices upon the lintels of whose doors there should show no grimy finger-marks of the money lender, and whose altar cloths should not be fringed with the colored seals of notary publics? Can the debt-driven slave stand in the grand aisles of such buildings and seek, in his misery, for guidance, when the very air about him is pungent with the taint of the trader in amalgamated ducats and

doxologies, who schedules in his assets the Lord's own, from the gilded tip of the spire down to the tiniest screw in the tabernacle? What succor for the weary can be extracted from such a compendium of unliquidated extravagancies? Shall the man of labor seek the Church for advice, when that very advice must be contrary to its practice?

The Church in this country is of tremendous strength and influence. It is made up of over 41 denominations. These 41 denominations comprise 164,805 organizations whose members amount, in round numbers, to 20,000,000 people. To accommodate this immense gathering of human beings there have been erected about 149,193 buildings, with seats for 43,500,000 persons, or over two sittings for every member. These are, from a religious point of view, very inspiring statistics, showing that, of the entire population of the land, nearly one out of three is a member of some denomination: free thought, free speech, free action and a free devil take care, we infer, of the other two thirds.

But there is a point in this tremendous aggregation of religious elements to which workingmen may advantageously give their attention. If capital is, as is charged, the enemy of labor; if it oppresses the industrial classes, and if it must be fought until, as radical agitators demand, there shall be an equalization if not an extinction of wealth; if these and

other evils endure to the peril of industry, what shall be said of the Church which, in the United States, is possessed of property to the amount of \$681,541,085, (over \$10 for each man, woman and child, of the country), and which property is exempt, we believe, from taxation in every state in the Union? Have rabid capital-haters taken into account, in their denunciation of wealth-acquirers, that the Church is the one great money power that is favored by special legislation? That it owns income-producing property that is exempt from the impost of taxes levied upon the hard working citizen; that it carries on vast commercial undertakings based in part upon such exemptions? Do these reformers ever contemplate the financial power of the Church, and realize that it exceeds that of any individual state, and approximates to, if it does not exceed, that of the general government, in property holdings, and in the means employed in its executive and administrative departments?

We say nothing of its debts, which though enormous, and beyond immediate statistical computation, are in themselves elements of strength and not weakness, compelling all possible leniencies, in direct contrast to the treatment given to ordinary business transactions. Millionaires sink out of sight in the sea of bankruptcy every day, but seldom does the Church suffer such a fate for any of its compo-

ment parts. It is not difficult, in view of its temporal aggrandizements and its spiritual purposes, to understand why the Church is a very disheartening study for the industrial classes.

But is this great reforming and regenerating force doing its worldly duty by the workmen? In what way are its ameliorating influences exerted for his benefit in the matter of softening the hardships of his position, or in educating him in a knowledge of how to obtain a release from his bondage of debt and to stay released, of a way to counter the difficulties of a struggle for life, difficulties that are puzzling the intellectual forces of the most profound thinkers of the world? The Church is not consistent in its treatment of mankind. It will spend thousands of dollars to convert a Jew in Jerusalem, to baptize a Hindu child in India, or to hide the nakedness of an African woman with a text-embroidered apron; but in the great cities are hived countless thousands of cheerless, almost hopeless workers, for whom a guidance through worldly troubles, a little solace from spiritual sources, a touch of the hand, an inspiring word from the lips, would come as the manna came from heaven, and work more good for the cause of human salvation than the conversion of an entire continent of heathens. If the Church were practical it would make a business of glorifying the lives, and brightening the homes, and evangelizing the souls of

the American Slaves. It would employ its millions of dollars and the physical and mental strength of the rank and file of its armies of workers, in saving the bodies as well as the souls of the multitudes who cannot rescue themselves. Men want material aid first; the spiritual will surely follow. Can a starving man appease his hunger by listening to texts and homilies from a well-fed man? Will faith and an orthodox sermon buy food for the family, or pay back rent, or settle any of the financial obstacles of life?

If the workman keeps away from church, it is not so much because he is a cowardly sinner as it is because he has a manly pride in not taking "that back seat" that has become an apothegm of church attendance; it is because he wants the roast beef, and not the entrees, of a Sabbath discourse. If Christ were once more preaching on earth, would he feed the multitude with theories rather than with facts? Would his sermons be according to the wisdom of his listeners, or would they be keyed up to the understanding of logicians and philosophers? Would he talk of the natural, which everybody may comprehend, or of the supernatural, which the hardest of theological training fails to penetrate? The A B C's of life, plain or colored, are the needs of the hour; sophisms about the hereafter teach nothing and prove nothing.

It is not a matter of surprise that the Roman Catholic

Church has become, more than any other denomination, the poor man's friend. It strives to make life worth living, and under its teachings death becomes something more than a terrible penalty for having lived. It preaches hope. Its temples are free to all. The music of its choirs reaches the heart. The voices of its priests ascend to heaven for rich and poor alike. To its solemn pageantries all are welcomed. By its ministrations sin is softened, and sorrow alleviated. Priest and penitent come together in misery as well as gladness. The wicked confess, and their lives are whitened. The poor seek counsel reverently and hopefully, and their appeals are not to deaf ears and dumb lips. There is companionship, and trust, and faith, as between the humble souls and the church which ministers to them. In its relation to men and the government Archbishop Ireland has declared that—"The position of the Catholic Church is easily defined. She stands for rights and duties, for labor and for capital so long as both follow duties and the one allows the right of the other. But always and everywhere and above all the civil and social interest or considerations, she stands for public justice and social order. She abhors and forbids all approach to lawlessness and anarchy; she commands obedience to law, and stern loyalty to country and its institutions."

Why discriminate? Let it be considered that ail de-

nominations are animated by the same spirit, have the same object in view and cherish the same theories of public welfare. But we ask why the beautiful flowers of human nature, as we have it, are not developed to a glorious fruition? Why have such a sedulous cultivation of the thistles and nettles of abstract religious polemics? We are writing about Church and Churches as if they were what they ought to be—temples of the Lord. We do not mean a minister's church—the church of Talmage, or Spurgeon, or Swing. The worldly and the devout have come, in many cases, to classify congregations by the name of the divine who leads them, and who, in many minds, takes precedence of the Christ whose teachings he professes to follow. We refer to the Church as a church for all, where English is spoken, where Orientalism in subject and language has given way to comprehensible lessons as to temporal and spiritual duties. Put thoughts for workmen in workmen's clothes and not in a broadcloth-and-linen vocabulary, and then they will understand much that is now, for them, enigmas.

Christ preached for the poor rather than the rich. He was understood. To-day the poor are given balloon ideas instead of bread-and-meat thoughts. The average churches are capitalistic, because, from an utilitarian point of view, a rich sinner is more valuable than a needy saint.

The railway workers' strike of 1894 temporarily aroused, if it did not alarm the orators of the pulpit. If there were slaves on the back seats they heard the detonations of the toy torpedoes of modern defenders of the faith. Rip Van Winkles of religions woke up all over the country, and discovered that the American workman was not torpid but dangerously alive. One Chicago divine, feeling that a sermon for the poor might not be inappropriate, suggested that—"The people who feel the hard times most severely are God's people. They are the workingmen, the men with moderate income and thought for something besides wealth. The wealthy are not, as a rule, God's people. Faith must be put in the words of the apostle. In hard times the one who feels it most needs not so much gold and silver as comfort and inspiration. No poor man should be turned away without kind words, however little money can be spared, even though he be known to be a rascal and a hypocrite. He should be shown there is an aid beyond that of finance."

Another minister treated his people to a dissertation on "hard times." The American Slave may have been in that congregation. He may have understood that—"All good men believe in about the same essentials. But when we come to formulating our creeds, differences arise. These, however, are largely conflicts of forms rather than of principles, of opin-

ions rather than of convictions, of the letter rather than of the spirit. When our deeds are our creeds and our lives are our liturgies, how well do all good men agree! Orthodox theology is of little value unless it inspires one to do his orthodox duties. We cannot believe that God loves orthodox theology as he loves orthodox purity, orthodox honesty, orthodox kindness, orthodox manliness. Nor can we think that the divine Being hates the infidelity of men's philosophies as he hates the infidelity of men's meanness, pride, selfishness and dishonesty. There is no religion that can save a man except the religion that makes him a good man."

But what comfort did he derive from a lesson that ended with this sort of consolation: "There is philosophy as well as Christianity and we must take things as they come. The shortsightedness of begrudging one's neighbor is shown in the ignorance of that neighbor's actual condition. With elegant mansion and large income, apparent happiness and prosperity, are the family skeletons, the endangered wealth, the cancer that is eating away the vitals of domestic happiness, the mortgages which threaten to take away the wealth-laden home. The man whose prosperity is envied by his neighbor may be praying for death as a relief."

It would be useless to quote others. The occasion brought out hesitations and hedgings between the

teachings of Christ on the side of the poor, and the income of the Church on the side of the rich—between the soul under blue jeans and the soul under black broadcloth. The minister is more politic than the editors of religious weeklies. *The Christian at Work* of New York city said that—"Allowing for all misconceptions, the ill-advised conduct, the outrages and indefensible brutalities marking the course of the strikers in this struggle, it cannot be denied that there is a measure of right and justice in their cause. That great wrongs exist in the industrial world, wrongs against the workers that need to be righted, is a truth which must be recognized. That the strikers have resorted to criminal methods to right these wrongs does not alter the fact of their existence. For these crimes they should be punished as other criminals are punished. There can be no justification for the fiendish deeds which are being committed in the name of Labor. But back of all the strife and struggles are the conditions which have produced it; to these the minds of all who desire the peace and prosperity of the country must be turned. Shotguns, prisons, courts of law and boards of arbitration will not heal this social disease. We must get at the sources of it, or our industrial fabric will perish."

Nearly all agree that, underneath the wrongs done by workmen, there are deeper wrongs done to them

for which there must be redress. With the law no longer a protector of their condition, and the courts becoming inaccessible through the expense attending upon any appeal for justice, the workman finds himself isolated in matters of personal rights. The time has been, and still is, for the Church to become the guide and champion of the poor in temporal as in spiritual affairs, if humanity is to be equalized on earth as in heaven, and until the Church becomes a more active factor in the regeneration of the flesh and blood of the human race, regardless of creeds, caste and color, and apart from all schemes for soul insurance, then the wonderful teachings of that wonderful Christ teacher, the revolutionizer of human kind, will lose their vitality and their value. With its fabulous wealth, its immeasurable power, and its aggregation of the grandest intellectual forces of the world, it belongs to the Church to do the heavy work in the emancipation of "all who are weary and heavy laden."

XI.

Insensibly, surely, and universally labor agitation has produced labor caste. It is the inevitable result of the co-operation of the many labor organizations that there should be developed a pronounced sentiment as to the degrees of merit or excellence of each different class of industry. Trades do not admit that socially or intellectually, or in occupations of skill, or where scientific attainments are requisite, or where a knowledge of mechanics is imperatively necessary, that all are upon one dead level. Labor, which has perfected itself only by the hard experience and untiring trials of many years, naturally regards itself as of a higher order than that avocation which needs but little judgment, is quickly acquired, and susceptible of immediate replacement. The diamond cutter is rated above the cutter of marble and granite; the goldsmith is on a higher plane than the chain forger; the mason is superior to the hod-carrier, and the machinist must possess more ability than the horse-shoer. Will the typesetter admit that he is of no more importance and value to the world than the teamster, and will the practical electrician range himself in the same grade as the

gas maker? Yet these necessary and inevitable class divisions of labor are insurpassable barriers to that communism which a certain kind of society reformers are scheming to establish in the world of industry. The employees of certain railroads recently made an exhibit of power that, for a brief but chaotic time, suppressed trade, commerce and manufactures. This very caste condition to which we have referred was prominent among the unions. Wise leadership developed class antagonisms and drew dividing lines so broad as to make absolute co-operation impossible. Many classes of railroad employees would not strike. It was not mutiny, but a sagacious refusal to enlist and chance a struggle in which everything might be lost and nothing practical gained. It was not human nature for the workmen with knowledge and skill, the drilled trooper of labor, to submit, voluntarily, to a sacrifice of his interests for the benefit of those whose employment was beneath him, because it was not so valuable to his employer or the country. Yet to a certain extent these very outbreaks brought certain castes into compact order under a flush of enthusiasm as evanescent as the puff of smoke from a cannon.

Col. Clark E. Carr, in a speech at a regimental reunion, said he saw symptoms of caste in the labor agitation of the day; but, as may be seen, his apprehensions were based upon a distinction between labor and capital. He said:

"I do not like the idea that there is a distinctive laboring class in this country, as distinguished from other citizens. It tends to permanently set apart one portion of our citizens to the drudgeries of manual labor—that is, it establishes caste. I have no patience with the idea that because a man is a mechanic, a clerk, engineer, conductor, brakeman, or common laborer or farm hand to-day he must permanently remain in what is known as the laboring class. Marshall Field has been his whole life a laboring man; so have Potter Palmer, John B. Drake, C. B. Farwell, Joseph Medill, Franklin MacVeagh, and nearly every prominent man in Chicago. C. H. Chappell, A. N. Towne, John D. Besler, and the late James T. Clark were railroad workers. The laborer may be the employer to-morrow. Arbitration recognizes caste, assuming that there is a capital caste and a laboring class, and cannot remedy the evil. I can see no way out of the difficulties save by co-operation."

But the establishment of such a grading could not be enduring, for the reason that there would be a constant changing of the component parts, the ceaseless and successful rising to a higher social plane, and vigorous contestants taking their places—just such quite revolutions as have been going on for thousands of years, and such as will continue as long as nature and men are what they are.

There must be an aristocracy in all things; for birth, mental endowments, physical developments and social and personal surroundings are different for each man, woman and child. If all persons were equal in all things, existence would be stagnation and stagnation a living death. The desire to excel and the ambition to acquire raise men out of the quagmire of inaction. Mr. Charles E. Banks fears that the recognition of an aristocracy of and in labor is inviting the world to become muscle worshipers. He has written: "Let us look first at the trades or callings represented by the present labor agitators. Miners, railroad firemen, switchmen and brakemen form the nucleus of the army, led by their self-appointed General Debs. To these are added unions of every description from teamsters down to bar-tenders. In the long published list of organizations which contemplate going on a strike for the purpose of starving the remainder of humanity into sympathy with them, there was no labor represented other than muscle labor. No cunning artificer or clever accountant, no task in which study, practice, skill, is required was represented in any of the so-called 'labor unions' that proclaimed their superior right to set the standard of wages and then enforce idleness for themselves and their fellows while more intelligent workers labored to feed them. The plan was evidently this: workers with fine tools on costly sub-

stances—workers who were required not only to bring to their tasks trained fingers and clear eyes but educated brains and patience, energy and care, should continue to work and contribute of their earnings to those self-same idlers.

“Have we come to be a nation of muscle worshipers? Is coal-heaving and wood-sawing the only labor worthy of respect? Must we emulate the action of the steamboat ‘roustabout’ rather than that of the weaver of laces or the writer of history? God forbid! The task which requires the least preparation for its execution has always been the poorest paid. The farmer cannot hope to succeed in his calling without systematic training. The merchant must serve a number of years as errand-boy, under-clerk, book-keeper, buyer and seller of the goods of others before he can hope to successfully open an establishment of his own. But against these and similar vocations the muscle laborers have the dictum, ‘Sympathize with us, contribute or starve.’ There might be some show of justice in this if it were proved that the muscle laborer had a monopoly in his field of work. But, on the contrary, the late railroad strike demonstrated the general manager’s ability to run an engine, the bookkeeper’s willingness and strength to fire it, and the porter’s intelligence to handle a switch for its passage. And all these without an hour’s preparation.

"Suppose the men employed in the offices, the professions and the arts were to sit down, fold their hands, and say to the muscle workers: 'Get along without us. We are tired of working for your benefit.' How long would the members of these boasted labor unions exist? Just so long as they could riot on the savings of these more skillful toilers and no longer. It is time labor should be respected for what it accomplishes and not for its name alone. No man has a more enduring sympathy for the toilers of the world than have the writers and thinkers of modern times. But because these men have a clear vision that covers a wide range, because they recognize the right to respect of all labor that is productive, the muscle-worker cries out against the man, turns to applaud the few who utter vicious thoughts, who counsel anarchy and chaos.

"Let us be fair, O fellow workmen. There are many vineyards and the fruit of each requires different handling. Out of the lower, the heavier, we may advance to the higher, the lighter labor. But strikes will not help to do it. Better wages we all desire, but better wages come only with better work. Coercing by starvation is a false theory and falsehood never yet accomplished good."

Mr. Banks is right, theoretically, but all danger of muscle worship exceeding the bounds of sanity might be quickly and easily avoided by organizing

unions of brain workers and finger workers. When you begin to classify avocations you lay a foundation for caste and sow the seeds of an aristocracy, not of wealth or blood, but of the conquering attributes of industry. Aristocracy, as we know it to-day, in fact and fiction, is the tail end of generations which thrived on robbery, rapine, lust, piracy and omnivorous crimes without names. Aristocracy, as it might be, and may be, can emanate from muscle and mind, and in the centuries to come no man, tracing out his genealogy, would have need to blush in discovering that his streak of blue blood began its trickling in the heart of one who honestly labored with hand or head. The goldsmiths of ancient Troy and mediæval London, the silver workers of prehistoric India, and the sword-makers of biblical Damascus, have worked their achievements into living events, and we know them as castes of labor so high, and so distinctive, that history has made their trades immortal.

Society is in no danger from these minor divisions of life, which are really only stimulants to perfection. Any attempt to amalgamate castes, any conspiracy to unify diverse social and industrial elements, is sure to be defeated by the hostile selfishness and the belligerent pride of the people who compose such classes. This is the fate that overtakes such aristocratical combinations, or in current phrase, such

“capitalistic syndicates.” Labor is just as jealous, just as sensitive, just as powerful as capital; and as capital has its castes and its degrees of worth, so will labor follow natural laws, and rate its clansmen as to their financial and intellectual assets. As capital has its class hates and prejudices, and is continually at war within its lines, or scheming for the ruin or disgrace of its members, labor will do the same; for by what process can it eradicate from human nature those evils of existence implanted by the Creator in man, and the absence of which would make him a god?

Caste will not help the American Slave; it will hurt him. The more skillful his hands, the more active his brains, the greater his ambition, the more uncontrollable his desire for rising in life, the less careful he will become in his means of reaching higher places and the more easily he will, in his needs, fall a prey to the credit caste and that vulture of industry, that scavenger of suffrage scraps, the Politician.

XII.

The French have always been fine fellows in shouting "down" with this, that and the other thing, ranging from a placard on a wall to a king's head on a throne. Unhappily for the personal security of the people threatened, this fateful cry is generally answered in the affirmative. In this country the gentlemen who are permitted to do the workmen's talking have been vociferous at public meetings in crying out, "down with the press," "down with the capitalistic newspapers," "down with the robber-journals," and so forth. And they are so earnest about this particular subject for demolition, and there is such uniformity in the outcry, as to awaken a suspicion that the orators have in the matter a personal hate caused, possibly, by newspaper criticisms. At the same time it is the fashion and the fancy of the day for the journalists to write about what they term the "pure press," and to affirm, in substance, that newspapers exist as barriers between Law and Anarchy, upholding the one and opposing the other, and by their broad diffusion of unbiased information becoming a sort of balance-wheel in governmental affairs.

Let us consider whether either party is right! How long a time is it since a certain line of newspapers, meaning weeklies as well as dailies, amused their readers with editorials and with cartoons that incited the rage or the ridicule, or both, of the wage-earners against employers? The same papers had no hesitation in pictorially degrading the President, Congress, Supreme Court Judges, anybody and everything, in an effort to curry favor with workmen. Going still lower, these papers told the laborers that they were serfs, slaves, valets, vassals, and in all menial conditions possible, to capital and capitalists. The English language was exhausted in finding terms of opprobrium for men who had money, and new catchwords of insult were invented. Cartoons were concocted for men who could not read, and were sermons of sedition so far as effects were concerned. In fact, little more could have been done to create hatred between the labor-hirers and the men hired, and to plant the seeds of an insurrection. The papers which did this were not capitalist papers, neither were they pure or unprejudiced; on the contrary, they were mercenary and venal—wantons in journalism and the pariahs of society. They helped to lay the groundwork of strikes, boycotts, riots and murder, not in a campaign of principle, but as ambushes for plunder. The law was made contemptible, and the officers of the law, from President down to

village constable, become ridiculous and detestable. Was this true journalism? Have such assaults helped the cause of labor? The satire of incendiarism, the petition of a bludgeon, the conclusion of dead workmen slaughtered as a result of the logic of cobble stones, are certainly not arguments in behalf of industrial reforms.

But there is caste in journalism as in other professions. There are good, bad and indifferent newspapers. We doubt whether there are pure ones. A "pure press" is, in the nature of things, an impossible press, because in journalism, as in all other kinds of business, selfishness is the dominant power; and where selfishness exists, purity of thought, purpose and action at once become unmixable elements. Sentiments and Sunday school texts have but little influence in business transactions. Newspapers are business enterprises, conducted for certain money-making purposes; and to carry out those purposes, all legitimate, if not exactly creditable, means are employed. They try to impart news and give advice; the first is what is given them, the second is what they give away in the shape of personal opinions. Both may be biased by party affiliations, by personal ignorance, by religious warpings, or by a greed for wealth or power that goes for everything and stops at nothing.

It is a waste of words for labor agitators to denounce

the press as being capitalistic. It takes a good deal of money to conduct the cheapest of newspapers, and a large proportion of the journals of this country are owned or managed by ex-workmen, retired wage-earners, men with level heads and long pockets. If their owners are rich the attitude of the paper is naturally capitalistic, that of self-defense,—just as the laborer will fight in defense of the wallet containing his weeks' wages without inquiring of the robber whether he is for or against capital. As a party or political paper deriving power and support from one of the great parties, it must, necessarily, be subservient to and controlled by the creed of that organization, preach its doctrines, whether they are right or wrong, and so secure as a portion of its reward, an agreed upon share of the spoils of victory. Such journals seldom break away from their tethers and act in hostility to the plans outlined by the high officials of their party. As its faction goes, so goes the party newspaper; and as all the parties, hungry for the votes of the laborer, are anti-capitalistic, so ought to be the newspaper organs which help to speak for them. Whether there can be honesty of purpose or sincerity of opinion in this sort of combination is a question which the workman is as well able as anybody else to decide.

As for the religious press, quote it as a hybrid—part saint and part sinner—but necessarily, with

more than enough of the latter to so pepper and salt the former as to give it a palatable flavor. It mixes business with religion, religion with politics, politics with domestic affairs, and domestic affairs with affairs of state, until sane heads grow heavy with the multiplicity of creeds, dogmas, fanatical theories and hyperborean sentiments, all turned out with a stony indifference to the needs of mankind for something enlivening. Primarily the offspring of capital, else they could not exist, they inflate themselves continually with the dried apples and water of such theories as appear to be most conducive to the success, first of themselves, then of the Church, and, lastly, of the public in general. How can such journalism be what is termed pure, with such eccentricities of purpose and such contrarieties of opinions and results? Is it consistent to denounce man, on one page, as a sinner, and on another to paint him as a saint, because the editorial end of the concern must sermonize and the business end cajole? Still, whatever the attitude of the paper, it must always be remembered that the religious press tries to be a business press; and every hardened man of the world knows that the business man deals in ideas that range from old junk up to jewels. The religious papers have not done their duty by the workman. The railroad boycott brought out from them criticisms, comments and advice; but, like the coadjutors

of the pulpit in the conspiracy times of peace, they ran in their editorial columns ethical disquisitions, and salvation recipes, but mighty little of intellectual hard tack for men of muscle. The journalism of the church is not the press by which industry is benefited, sorely as it may need its alliance.

As for what is termed the "independent" press, it exists only as an ideal. It cannot exist as a real. Publishers and editors are ordinary mortals so far as resources are concerned and, in matters of business, consider self first and the people afterwards. Whenever they take a stand in political or social affairs, it is taken for money, or power, or both. As a marketable commodity their influence and that of their paper is for sale, just as other men sell their time, their goods, or the product of their brains. Editors and publishers are poor, weak mortals and, as the saying runs, they are not getting out newspapers for love or for their health. If, in this taken-for-granted independence, they tell you one thing to-day as being the truth and to-morrow assert as the truth something diametrically opposite, they are not so much liars as they are dealers in expedients permissible in journalism. When, in political matters, they lead you to a precipice of principle, and then, in the dark, abandon you, you will find, if you escape the peril, that your guides are not traitors but philosophers. If, when you are absolutely starving for truth,

they fill you full of alluvial errors and jingling falsehoods, don't call them clowns but credit them with being tillers of a too willing soil. In general the "independent" promises everything, gives nothing and does business on the margins. With its butterfly strategies, its starveling ideas rattling against each other like autumn leaves, with a consistency that's inconsistent in advocating social heresies and political suicides, this style of newspaper, like the little cricket by the way-side, chirps its valorous notes, and believes the whole world deafened with its noise.

But there are newspapers which do a world of good. If they are managed by brave, sagacious, fair-minded men, they are almost always to be found advocating reforms to benefit the poor, the wretched, the homeless and the hopeless. They show an indefatigable philanthropy in behalf of great charities and vast public enterprises, and aim to conserve, with jealous care, the interests of the people of commonwealths. In political matters they are, unfortunately, dominated by party platforms and are compelled to travel, tender-footed, over roads paved with vexing problems not down in the charts. They are watchful, to a fighting point, of state sovereignty, and generous in the support of the church. Their ideas of Political Economy are as diverse as the specifics of physicians, and their prescriptions for the cure of political evils are equally as uncertain as those of doctors for the

human body. Day by day they give the public a diagnosis of the world for the previous twenty-four hours, and night by night that world goes to bed with more knowledge of itself than the greatest prophet or wildest statesman has ever dreamed of obtaining.

The Press is such a composite creation of wit and wisdom, purity and impurity, crankiness and caprices, inconsistency and firmness, enthusiasm and fanaticism, weakness and stability, vigor and vapidness, generosity and meanness, and illumined by such a ceaseless display of the thunder and lightning of a great heaven of intellect, as to be the wonder of the present and a possible puzzle for the future.

XIII.

It is admitted by the ablest of economic doctors that society is seriously ill. There is an insanity of labor that is believed to be curable; there is a high fever, breaking into delirium, that is dangerous; and there is a condition of melancholia that is the germinating bed of crime. We have shown an indifferent public the American Slave as the victim of evils created, fostered and endorsed by the government, by the Church and by society. To free the slave we must eradicate the disease and right the wrongs of the industrial classes. They have wrongs, and serious ones—wrong the causes of which are not to be removed by the sophistries of statesmen, the veneered philanthropy of congressmen, the bass drum prayers of the Church, or the charity hops of the wealthy. The question before the people is not Why? but How? That question must be answered quickly and effectively. Religion has had its Reformation, and its title deed to Liberty is written in blood. Let us not wait until labor is forced to secure its manumission through a similar ordeal!

But the best of our noted men are puzzled as to

what the means shall be. Workmen should understand that the formation of or the amalgamation with political parties will increase and not decrease the economic evils of their condition, because the politician has not a grain of philanthropy in his composition and, acting entirely from self-interest, considers the wage-working elements as worth only that complaisant attention which will secure their ballot. That ballot once obtained, the confiding voter must wait until the next election for a repetition of the deception.

Avoiding these ambushes of traitorous friends, the industrial classes may be relieved through less pernicious and dangerous methods than strikes and boycotts. Archbishop Ireland has said that these "strikes read a lesson to capital. Capital must for its own sake, as well as for humanity's sake, be mindful of its own duties and of the rights and interests of labor. The solution to the differences between capital and labor is necessarily complex, and no one precise form has been or can be found. A generous sense of justice toward all, a deep love of one's fellows, and attentive listenings to the teachings of Christ will lead on all sides to a better understanding and to happier mutual relations. Certain it is that, so far as possible, the laborer should not lack the means of decent support for himself and his family; he should not be overburdened either in weight or time

of labor; he should be treated as a rational and a moral being, with all respect due his human dignity. His remuneration, if diminishing in periods of depression, should increase in periods of business prosperity. Industries which allow some profit-sharing, which secures the laborer from want in sickness and old age, gain strength to themselves, while comforting the workingman. And as to some means of prevention of strikes and dangerous disputes between capital and labor, nothing better so far has been suggested than arbitration, within all the lines of wisdom and justice that national legislation can throw around it. Arbitration will have at least moral conclusions against which neither capital nor labor could well stand out."

The noted Chauncey M. Depew, the great railway sovereign, the all-around orator of banquets, the public man with more gumption than nine out of ten of his kind, insists that in "avoiding strikes and keeping the men in a good frame of mind something more than money is necessary. You must realize that the workingman is a man and that he wants to be treated like a man. In other words, he wants to be treated precisely as you yourself enjoy being treated. If you are in the employ of any man—even in the highest position in his establishment, be it factory or shop—and if the man shows an indifference to your personality, you dislike him, and some day you're going to

get even, aren't you? The fire is smoldering. And for each time he grumbles when you are absent a day to go to a funeral, or are late from the bedside of a dying member of the family, or are ill yourself, you're laying up a grudge that will be repaid in his own coin with interest. Therefore, I say that men who are in the employ of others ask for more than money. More money will not satisfy them—except temporarily. They will take it, but they secretly chafe. When there is a grievance, if they have been paid in money alone, they will be ready to join in with the grieved spirits. Men who treat their employees thus are the men who can never lower their wages a dollar nor a cent. Woe be to them if they try to 'come down' upon the only coin in which the men are paid. But if they have treated their men like men—even like gentlemen—they can do a great deal with them. Try this, and see for yourself."

Ex-Senator J. R. Doolittle, a noted judge, jurist and statesman, a man who by reason of his profession is expected to profoundly study great public questions from all points, suggested in an open letter to Mr. Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor, a number of reforms as to industrial troubles, one of them being that—"a law should be enacted by each State in this Union that in all disputes between State corporations and their employees on the subject of lockouts, strikes, and the rate of

wages, if the employees, or a majority in any branch thereof, shall be desirous and willing to submit the matter to the decision of competent arbitrators and the corporation shall refuse, then they may apply to the Circuit Court having jurisdiction for the appointment of three impartial and competent persons. If the parties are unable to agree upon them, each shall name one, and the court shall name the third, and their award shall be final and binding for such period as may be fixed by law."

Justice Brewer of the United States Supreme Court is reported as saying in commenting on the connection of trade unions with the railway strike: "Some people think that it will annihilate them, but I believe that it will, in the end, make labor organizations stronger. They will see the necessity of placing at their head strong, cool, and clear-headed men, like Arthur of the locomotive engineers, and discarding enthusiasts of the Debs order. With such men at their head they will be much more powerful, and great trouble will be avoided."

The remedy of profit-sharing, as urged by labor arbitrators, brought out from the *Chicago Tribune* the following among other objections: "The labor leaders are careful not to explain to the members of the unions that the chances of increased employment being given in shops and factories depend upon the "bosses" having made profits and invested them

in the business, or hoping to make profits had borrowed and put in new capital; but these facts are highly important for workmen to know. Every additional \$1,000 of capital on the general average, taking all lines of industrial business together, will furnish employment to one additional workman, and his earnings spent for the supply of his and his family's wants, will give employment to many kinds of other labor, equal in its functions to the employment of another man. These simple facts in political economy are never told to the workman in the labor lodges by their walking delegates and other salaried agitators."

A Southern paper, the *News*, of Galveston, Texas, denounces all attempts to force compulsory arbitration upon the country, saying it is "foolishness, and the most dangerous kind of foolishness at that. Every laboring man who values his own freedom should hold on to the right of contract in spite of the efforts of his enemies or of his friends to deprive him of it. Without this right he is a slave to some personal or impersonal master, with nothing that he can call his own—neither his time, his labor, nor the form, the application, and the usufruct of it."

The doctors disagree, and it is certain that the patient cannot swallow all their prescriptions. The general government, with a good many whereases, has appointed a commission to inquire into the cause of

the railway troubles of 1894. That commission has invited railways, labor organizations, and citizens having either a personal or patriotic interest in the right solution of those questions; and those who can not conveniently attend such public hearings, are requested to present their views and suggestions in writing to the commission at any time prior to the date of such public hearing. This is certainly very kind and very considerate on the part of the President and Congress; but the probabilities are that by the time this commission is ready to report, men now young will be old; and by the time the government is prepared to adopt efficient measures of reform, the millennium or a revolution may have rendered them unnecessary.

If some of the imperturbable philosophers of old Greece or Rome were alive, and were revolving in their minds the woes of their fellow men, a practice which gave them more wisdom than was usable, they might pick up the national platform of the Democratic party and read the accusation that the Republican party, while professing a policy of reserving the public land for small holdings by actual settlers, has given away the people's heritage, till now a few railroads and non-resident aliens, individual and corporate, possess a larger area than that of all our farms between the two seas. The last Democratic administration reversed the improvident and unwise

policy of the Republican party touching the public domain, and reclaimed from corporations and syndicates, alien and domestic, and restored to the people, nearly one hundred million acres of valuable land. They would not be surprised by either the donation or the reclamation, for these men were surprised at nothing. If they sought the census returns—a very likely action—they would discover that the general government had 567,586,783 acres of vacant land—land to be had for a song. They might then gravely stroke their beards and wag their heads and wonder why a republican government, with armies of unemployed men, did not arrange with those men, upon reasonable terms and in a fatherly way, to occupy, improve and reclaim from savage nature this vast acreage. They might regard with alarm a condition of society that allowed great cities to be filled up with a reckless, improvident class of people, who were a constant menace to law and order, while the great west was burdened with untilled lands which these people should be made to cultivate either by force or reward, and so relieve the pressure from industry, distribute the fomenting masses of disorderly elements and civilize and utilize them by the influence of nature.

To the American Slaves these philosophers pertinently might render this advice:

“Think for yourselves.

"Act for yourselves.

"Trust only yourselves.

"Keep out of debt.

"Spend less than you earn.

"Consider life as a difficult lesson to be learned and arrange to take your vacation in the life to come."

XIV.

In the early years of this government lived a gentleman named Franklin—Benjamin Franklin. He assisted at the birth of the republic, helped nurse it through all those infantile miseries that attend the childhood of such a kind of government, and was, besides, a workman and a philosopher. As a type of the last two he left many words of wisdom which succeeding generations either have not known, or have forgotten, or choose to disregard on the plea that his ideas are, according to present social conditions, the opinions of an old fogey. A little tract which he wrote and to which he gave the title of "The Way to Wealth," is so meaty with pertinent truths as to justify its reproduction for the benefit of men of all trades and occupations of the present time.

The preface to the original London edition of sixty years ago had this explanatory introduction:

"Dr. Franklin, wishing to collect into one place all the sayings upon the following subjects which he had dropped in the course of publishing the Almanac called 'Poor Richard,' introduces Father Abraham for this purpose. Hence it is that Poor Richard is so often quoted, and that in the present title he is

said to be improved. Notwithstanding the stroke of humor in the concluding paragraph of this address, Poor Richard Saunders and Father Abraham have proved, in America, that they are no common preachers."

This little document, so wise in its sayings, and with those sayings more valuable to the present working people of the world than anything that the great Solomon uttered, begins in this way:

"COURTEOUS READER:—

"I have heard that nothing gives an author so great pleasure, as to find his works respectfully quoted by others. Judge, then, how much I must have been gratified by an incident I am going to relate to you. I stopped my horse, lately, where a number of people were collected at an auction of merchants' goods. The hour of the sale not being come, they were conversing on the badness of the times; and one of the company called to a plain, clean old man, with white locks:

"'Pray, Father Abraham, what think you of the times? Will not these heavy taxes quite ruin the country? How shall we ever be able to pay them? What would you advise us to do?'

"Father Abraham stood up and replied:

"'If you would have my advice, I will give it you in short, for "a word to the wise is enough," as Poor Richard says.'

"They joined in desiring him to speak his mind, and, gathering around him, he proceeded as follows:

"‘Friends,’ said he, ‘the taxes are indeed very heavy, and if those laid on by the government were the only ones we had to pay, we might more easily discharge them; but we have many others, and much more grievous to some of us. We are taxed twice as much by our idleness, three times as much by our pride, and four times as much by our folly; and from these taxes the commissioners cannot ease or deliver us, by allowing an abatement. However, let us harken to good advice, and something may be done for us. “God helps them that help themselves,” as Poor Richard says.

"‘It would be thought a hard government that should tax its people one tenth part of their time to be employed in its service; but idleness taxes many of us much more. Sloth, by bringing on disease, absolutely shortens life. “Sloth, like rust, consumes faster than labor wears; while the used key is always bright,” as Poor Richard says. “But dost thou love life? then do not squander time, for that is the stuff life is made of,” as Poor Richard says. How much more than is necessary do we spend in sleep! forgetting that “the sleeping fox catches no poultry, and that there will be sleeping enough in the grave,” as Poor Richard says.

"‘If time be of all things the most precious, wast-

ing time must be, as Poor Richard says, "the greatest prodigality!" since as he elsewhere tells us, "lost time is never found again; and what we call time enough, always proves little enough." Let us, then, up and be doing, and doing to the purpose; so, by diligence, shall we do more with less perplexity.

"Sloth makes all things difficult, but industry all easy; and he that riseth late must trot all day, and shall scarce overtake his business at night; while laziness travels so slowly, that poverty soon overtakes him. Drive thy business, let not that drive thee, and "early to bed and early to rise makes a man healthy, wealthy and wise," as Poor Richard says.

"So what signify wishing and hoping for better times? We may make these times better, if we bestir ourselves. Industry need not wish, and he that lives upon hope will die fasting. There are no gains without pains; then, help hands, for I have no lands, or, if I have, they are smartly taxed.

"He that hath a trade, hath an estate; and he that hath a calling, hath an office of profit and honor," as Poor Richard says. But then the trade must be worked at, and the calling well followed, or neither the estate nor the office will enable us to pay our taxes. If we are industrious we shall never starve; for, at the working man's house hunger looks in, but does not enter. Nor will the bailiff or constable

enter; for industry pays debts, while despair increases them.

“What though you have found no treasure, nor has any rich relative left you a legacy; diligence is the mother of good luck, and God gives all things to industry. Then plow deep, while sluggards sleep, and you shall have corn to sell and to keep. Work while it is called, ‘to-day,’ for you know not how much you may be hindered to-morrow. “One to-day is worth two to-morrows,” as Poor Richard says; and further, “Never leave that till to-morrow which you can do to-day.”

(1)“If you were a servant, would you not be ashamed that a good master should catch you idle? Are you, then, your own master? Be ashamed to catch yourself idle, when there is so much to be done for yourself, your family, your country, and benevolent movements. Handle your tools without mittens; remember that “the cat in gloves catches no mice,” as Poor Richard says. It is true, there is much to be done; and, perhaps, you are weak handed; but stick to it steadily, and you will see great effects; for constant dropping wears away stone; and by diligence and patience the mouse ate into the cable; and little strokes fell great oaks.

“Methinks I hear some of you say: “Must a man afford himself no leisure?” I will tell thee, my friend, what Poor Richard says: “Employ thy time well, if

thou meanest to gain leisure; and since thou art not sure of a minute, throw not away an hour." Leisure is time for doing something useful; this leisure the diligent man will obtain, but the lazy man never; for a life of leisure and a life of laziness are two things. Many, without labor, would live by their wits only; but they break for want of stock; whereas, industry gives comfort, and plenty, and respect. Fly pleasures, and they will follow you. The diligent spinner has a large shift; and, now I have a sheep and a cow, everybody bids me good-morrow.

(2) "But with our industry we must likewise be steady, settled and careful, and oversee our own affairs with our own eyes, and not trust too much to others; for as Poor Richard says:

"I never saw an oft removed tree,
Nor yet an oft removed family,
That throve so well as those that settled be."

"And again, "Three moves are as bad as a fire;" and again, "Keep thy shop and thy shop will keep thee;" and again, "If you would have your business done, go; if not, send." And again:

"He that by the plow would thrive,
Himself must either hold or drive."

"And again, "The eye of the master will do more work than both his hands;" and again, "Want of care does us more damage than want of knowledge;"

and again, "Not to oversee workmen, is to leave them your purse open."

"Trusting too much to others' care is the ruin of many; for, in the affairs of this world, men are saved not by faith, but by the want of it. But a man's own care is profitable; for, if you would have a faithful servant, and one that you like, serve yourself. A little neglect may breed great mischief; for want of a nail the shoe was lost; for want of a shoe the horse was lost; and for want of a horse the rider was lost, being overtaken and slain by the enemy—all for want of a little care about a horse's shoe nail.

(3) "So much for industry, my friends, and attention to one's own business; but to these we must add frugality, if we would make our industry more certainly successful. A man may, if he knows not how to save as he gets, keep his nose all his life to the grindstone, and die not worth a groat at last. A fat kitchen makes a lean will; and—

Many estates are spent in getting,
Since women for tea forsook spinning and knitting,
And men for punch forsook hewing and splitting.

"If you would be wealthy, think of saving as well as of getting. The Indies have not made Spain rich, because her outgoes are greater than her incomes. Away, then, with your expensive follies, and you will not then have so much cause to complain of hard times, heavy taxes and chargeable families; for

Woman and wine, game and deceit
Make the wealth small, and the want great.

“And further, what maintains one vice would bring up two children. You may think, perhaps, that a little tea, or a little punch now and then, diet a little more costly, clothes a little finer, and a little entertainment now and then, can be no great matter; but remember, many a little makes a mickle.

“Beware of little expenses! “A small leak will sink a big ship,” as Poor Richard says; and again, “Who dainties love, shall beggars prove;” and moreover, “Fools make feasts, and wise men eat them.” Remember what Poor Richard says: “Buy what thou hast no need of, and ere long thou shalt sell thy necessities.” And again, “It is foolish to lay out money in the purchase of a repentance;” many a one, for the sake of finery on the back, has gone with a hungry belly and half starved his family. “Silks and satins, scarlet and velvets, put out the kitchen fire,” as Poor Richard says. These are not the necessities of life; they can scarcely be called the conveniences; and yet, only because they look pretty, how many want to have them! By these and other extravagances, the genteel are reduced to poverty, and forced to borrow of those whom they formerly despised, but who, through industry and frugality, have maintained their standing; in which case it appears plainly that “a plowman on his legs is higher than a gentleman on his knees,” as Poor Richard says. “Always taking out of the meal-tub,

and never putting in, soon comes to the bottom," as Poor Richard says; and then, when the well is dry, they know the worth of water.

"If you would know the value of money, go and try to borrow some; for "he that goes a borrowing, goes a sorrowing," as Poor Richard says; and, indeed, so does he that lends to such people, when he goes to get it again. Poor Dick further advises, and says:

Fond pride of dress is sure a very curse:

Ere fancy you consult, consult your purse.

"And again, "Pride is as loud a beggar as Want, and a great deal more saucy." When you have bought one fine thing, you must buy ten more, that your appearance may be all of a piece; but Poor Dick says, "It is easier to suppress the first desire, than to satisfy all that follow it." And it is as truly folly for the poor to ape the rich, as for the frog to swell, in order to equal the ox. It is, however, a folly soon punished; for, as Poor Richard says, "Pride that dines on Vanity sups on Contempt. Pride breakfasted with Plenty, dined with Poverty, and supped with Infamy.

"After all, what use is this pride of appearance, for which so much is risked, so much is suffered? It cannot promote health, nor ease pain; it makes no increase of merit in the person, it creates envy, it hastens misfortune. But what madness it must be to run in debt for these superfluities! We are offered by the terms of this sale, six months credit, and that,

perhaps, has induced some of us to attend it, because we cannot spare the ready money, and hope now to be fine without it. But, ah! think what you do when you run in debt. You give to another power over your liberty. If you cannot pay at the time, you will be ashamed to see your creditor; you will be in fear when you speak to him; you will make poor, pitiful, sneaking excuses; and by degrees come to lose your veracity, and sink into base downright lying; for "the second vice is lying, the first is running in debt," as Poor Richard says. Lying rides upon debt's back; whereas a free-born man ought not to be ashamed or afraid to see or speak to any man living. But poverty often deprives a man of all spirit and virtue. It is hard for an empty bag to stand upright. What would you think of that prince, or of that government, who should issue an edict forbidding you to dress like a gentleman or gentlewoman, on pain of imprisonment or servitude? Would you not say you are free, have a right to dress as you please, and that such an edict would be a breach of your privileges, and such a government tyrannical? And yet you are about to put yourself under that tyranny, when you run in debt for such dress. Your creditor has authority, at his pleasure, to deprive you of your liberty, by confining you in jail for life, or by selling you for a servant, if you should not be able to pay him. When you have

got your bargain, you may, perhaps, think little of payment; but, as Poor Richard says, "creditors have better memories than debtors; creditors are a superstitious sect, great observers of set days and times." The day comes around before you are aware, and the demand is made before you are prepared to satisfy it; or if you bear your debt in mind, the term, which at first seems so long, will, as it lessens, appear extremely short. Time will seem to have added wings to his hands as well as his shoulders.

Gain may be temporary and uncertain; but ever, while you live, expense is constant and certain, and "it is easier to build two chimneys than to keep one in fuel," as Poor Richard says. So rather go to bed supperless than rise in debt.

Get what you can, and what you get hold;

'Tis the stone that will turn all your lead into gold.

"This doctrine, my friends, is reason and wisdom; but, after all, do not depend too much upon your own industry, and frugality, and prudence, though excellent things; for they may all be blasted without the blessing of heaven; and, therefore, ask that blessing humbly, and be not uncharitable to those that at present seem to want it, but comfort and help them. Remember, Job suffered, and was afterwards prosperous.

"And now, to conclude—"Experience keeps a dear school, but fools will learn in no other," as Poor

Richard says, "and scarce in that, for it is true we may give advice, but we cannot give conduct." However, remember this—"They that will not be counseled cannot be helped;" and, further, "If you will not hear Reason, she will surely rap your knuckles," as Poor Richard says.' "

"Thus the old gentleman ended his harangue. The people heard it, and approved the doctrine, and immediately practiced the contrary, just as if it had been a common sermon; for the auction opened, and they began to buy extravagantly."

Times have not changed greatly since this philosopher put into their settings these jewels of thought. People have quoted Poor Richard's wise sayings for over half a century, and admitted their truthfulness without knowing their author; but like the crowd at the auction, they have acted to the contrary. From them we find that the American Slave is not a creature of the industrial conditions of the present day; nor has his estate in society been unfavorably affected by improvements in machinery and labor-saving and labor-creating inventions imperatively demanded by a rapid increase in population and the necessities arising from the wants of the people. But the workman's extravagances have more than kept pace with the increase in cheapened luxuries, until he has come to indulge in the use of articles which only the wealthy should afford, and to obtain which

he does not sacrifice his needs, but simply runs in debt either for the necessities or the luxuries.

We have added these maxims not simply because they are absolute and practical truths, but because they ought to be embodied in those daily lessons of industrial life which every workman is compelled to study, and for the bitterness of whose tasks these pellets of wisdom may afford either relief or cure.

XV.

Viewing, as dispassionately as average human nature will permit, the wide-spread and seditious industrial convulsions of the last twenty years, and especially the almost instantaneous strikes of 1894 with their political effects, there are furnished sufficient truths to justify the prophecy that the republic of the United States is in the incipient stages of dissolution. The disclosures of these happily suppressed rebellions show that the entire construction of the government now rests upon the cones of labor volcanoes. It has been thus revealed that this great federation of mighty states is so underrun by the fires of political, and, as a necessary sequence, of labor conspiracies, and that such unreconcilable sectional antagonisms are being developed by unfair legislation, as to justify the assertion that unless there happens a miracle in statesmanship, or a radical revolution of public sentiment and action on economic questions, there will not be, in fifty years, such a government as the Republic of the United States.

Revolutions are crimes begotten by crimes. They

are the desperate measures of desperate men. They may be lawful in inception and criminal in results; or criminal in birth and philanthropic in effects. It was treason that gave us liberty. History is fruitful with examples as to how often liberty has been murdered by treason. Governor McKinley, of Ohio, in a Fourth of July address, began it by the assertion that "we are the freest government on the face of the earth," and concluded by the announcement, not exactly the coloring expected in a picture of freedom, that—"with industrial armies marching on Washington, and the military of both the States and the United States marching on organized labor; with a coal miners' strike that cost the country millions of dollars just ended, and a railroad strike that will cost no one yet knows how many millions more, now in progress; with tens of thousands toiling for less than enough to secure the necessary comforts of life, and other tens of thousands in idleness; with unrest and sullen dissatisfaction almost universal, we have a condition, not a theory, confronting us, that invites and demands immediate and serious attention." Do such ominous signs—not in the skies, but on land, tangible signs of insurrection—portend the stability of "the freest government?"

The signers of the Declaration of Independence, and the Continental Congress which backed that document, wrote and acted for comparatively few

people. Those people made up a nation of slave holders—a nation of white men owning black men as chattels. The Declaration was conceived, endorsed and executed by slaveholders. Until Lincoln's emancipation proclamation the United States was a paradoxical republic of liberty and slavery. Since the primal statesmen of this land gave us a constitution, one hundred and seven years ago, the conditions of territory, people, thoughts, actions, manners of life, surroundings and governmental contingencies have been wonderfully changed. The people of 1787 were no more like the people of 1894 than the Puritan of that day was like the Protestant of to-day. No other revolution ever wrought, in so brief a time, such astounding changes in places, ideas, and customs. It is not, then, a matter of surprise that the constitution which admirably met the wants of the thirteen original states is a noticeable misfit for the forty-four grand commonwealths of to-day. We are working with the legislative tools of a century ago. We are struggling to administer the affairs of a huge empire with the rules and by-laws and penalties originated for the control of a small family of sparsely settled states. From a little community of emaciated rebels we have become a nation of vast resources, of tremendous power, of irresistible people. But, contemplating the present, have we, as federated states, reached the culminating point as to unity, prosperity and amity?

There have been other commonwealths, other republics, other self-governing peoples. History is forgotten in the rush of every-day life, and national obliteration is recalled principally by history and ruins. These dead governments have tumbled down in times of peace, been shattered by war, or suffered dissolution by political suicide. Our great civil war demonstrated the elemental weakness of the fabric known as the United States. Of the disintegrating forces of that perilous period only one was eliminated—the BlackSlave. But other evils have been growing, with rank luxuriance, and breeding the parasites of such a license of thought, speech and action as to make treason as familiar as the sun by day and the stars by night. In other countries our systems of debt, politics and finance are the subject of more than desultory study; and the stability of the government is still doubted by the profounder thinkers of the day, who base their conclusions, in part, on the loose administration of the laws, and the indifference of the people to, if not their defiance of, such laws. As for the laws themselves, sinister legislation secures such flexibility in their construction that the people for whose protection they were enacted are too often made to suffer the penalty intended for the criminal who breaks them. When youngsters sit in judgment on the bench, and veterans, before them, manipulate the laws to suit themselves, taking ad-

vantage of ignorance and inexperience as Hindu jugglers do their tricks, law naturally loses its solemnity and respectability, and the people their hope of justice. Or, going higher, what should a foreigner, let alone a native, think of a federal court that would permit the utterance, during the consideration of a contempt case growing out of the railway strike, of the sentiment that the railroad workers had a right to combine and resist, and that their resistance would "raise the original question—original always in this republic—whether the people are sovereign, or whether they have delegated all their sovereignty to representatives who may sleep upon their trust; whether when the representatives sleep upon their trust, be it court or be it legislature, the inherent sovereignty for redress is not remitted by them back to the sovereign citizen to protest against the usurpation of tyranny by the combination and conspiracy of wicked men and wicked managers?"

Little things like these do not puzzle the old world students, though they may be surprised at the judicial inanition which characterizes their reception.

The public events of each hour, day, week, month and year compel us to contemplate, with feelings of shame, congressional bodies criminally negligent of their sacred duties to the people whom they are expected to represent, whose members are involved in the schemes of syndicates and trusts, and bar-

nacled with small dishonors when big ones are scarce. Is it not true that legislatures meet, and corrupt themselves, or spoil the honor of their state by enactments for personal or corporate greed, rather than by laws for the public welfare?

Judges on the bench now and then sully their ermine with official decrees and unofficial opinions in favor of monopolies and against the people—judges who obtained their preferment to place by tricks of suffrage that were the culmination of dishonest or tricky partisanship.

States which should be untiringly and forever jealous of the vital rights of the majority, have passed into the possession of the politicians; and from being known as the “mothers of presidents” and guardians of the people, have sunk so low as to be little better than “fences” for the stolen goods of political victories.

The Church is no longer the sanctuary of the poor, the persecuted and the erring, in whose temples the weary spirit may be at rest for a while, and the wickedness of life be buried in the strains of the organ, or borne heavenwards on the prayers of honest priests. Rather is it the caterer to the whims of people dyspeptic with doctrines for the rich only; or, as a resort for invalid souls whose faith circulation is feeble and stimulated by sugar-coated doctrines; or it is the trysting place of grotesque idol-

atries in fashion; or the waiting-place of worldly envies; or the treasure-house of all the isms and schisms to which religion is being continually subjected.

With Congress recreant to its solemn trusts, a Judiciary based upon corrupt suffrage, a State indifferent to the wants of its children, and a Church oblivious to the teachings of the Great Master who created it, what shall be said of the people for whom these energies were originated, and by whom they are permitted to exist? Feel the public pulse and test the people's tongue and temperature! What is the diagnosis?

Deep seated disorder, Rebellion, Revolution, Anarchy.

We find the monopolist arrayed against the workman, and the workman against the capitalist. We have syndicates of wealth on one side; on the other syndicates of labor, monopolies of organized political elements, weak as individuals but irresistible should they be sagaciously mobilized. A dangerous recklessness has already developed marked symptoms. Capital and its people have been assaulted on public highways and their property burned or pillaged. The ligatures of commerce have been cut, and its ramified systems of traffic paralyzed by mob violence. Millions of dollars will not make good the value of the property lost and the time wasted. Nothing human can restore to life those who perished in opposing the law.

But Labor, poorly generaled and with undrilled ranks, has won a victory, though a meager one, for it has made itself heard. Its claimed wrongs have been driven, like thunderbolts, into men's faces, and fallen, like bombs, into an obnoxious Congress. No matter if they did summon an army and were beaten. The mark of their grip on human events is ineffaceable.

As one result of this glare of organized disorder were revealed the flickerings of tiny flames of treason in high places. Public officials, by criminal slothfulness, or by insurrectionary sentiments, have opposed the general government. They have labored in favor of a paternalism of inaction. They have conspired for ballots while a mobocracy was struggling to disrupt the country with a fanaticism that leaped from ocean to ocean. When the chiefs of state and city governments feed sedition with words of sympathy, and reënforce it with the alliance of culpable inaction, then the people should look guardedly towards the future.

Had the strikers of 1894 been better drilled for patient waiting; had their unions been of all labors, united by one purpose, and animated, even to starvation, by one resolve; had there been a calm, clear-headed, dispassionate, far-seeing man at the head of the movement; and had there been unquestioning, unswerving obedience to such a leader—who might

have been a Bonaparte and a Bismarck in one body—then the Republic and its law-abiding people might have had a revolution that could not have been suppressed. They might have been strangled into submission to a set of rulers and into an allegiance to a new style of government the like of which, though successful, cannot endure.

Though this danger be passed, there is yet to come the overthrowing shock, the wrenching and disrupting struggle of sections. Intensely jealous of their sovereignty, states have at critical periods wavered in their loyalty to the general government. But to doubt, to hesitate in implicit fealty to the supreme power, is to weaken; to weaken is an initial effort in the process of disintegration. The people of geographical sections of the country long ago found a wide divergence in their requirements of the general government, which is like a sheep to be sheared, states being the shearers, and wool clipping being as close to the skin as possible, without drawing blood. But the blood will be drawn, some day.

The states are only held together by strings of mutual interest. Each governs itself; each is a law unto itself. States, as well as individuals, may riot. They are, already, well-organized communities. They have men, arms, money, food—all the materials of war. They have no standing armies, but they have the seeds for them in the militia. Do their people

want war? In many states the population is already leavened with a hatred of law and of the people who abide by the law. It is claimed by these malcontents that they cannot, under the present onerous condition of government, enjoy life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. There is a spirit of revolt among the laboring classes, a conspiracy of revolution among politicians, and a taint of treasonable independence among chief magistrates.

Besides these restive components of the governed are the farmers, the manufacturers and the mine owners. For these influential factors of general industry the legislation of federal government has, as to their productions, not only been unwise and unfair, but has created feelings of dissatisfaction, as yet confined only to murmurs, for which no adequate remedy has been found, every attempt at harmonious action resulting in collisions with the interests of other people, in other businesses, in other states; and he will be a mad statesman who undertakes to effect the reconciliation necessary to permanent and satisfactory adjustments. In these times it is idle to talk of patriotism when the State comes first and the general government last. In business, patriotism is only an abstract sentiment; it is self-interest that makes the compact and enduring unions.

Fifty years hence, what will be the government of this continent? will soon be a question of predomi-

nant interest. A central government is faintly discussed, but declared impracticable because states will cede no more power. A constitutional monarchy is hinted at; but we are wanting in an aristocracy and cannot, under present laws, import seedlings, and the accretions, by marriage, are dishearteningly slow.

We have drawn pictures on the lines of existing circumstances. Is it a treasonable prophecy to declare, after a consideration of the facts and the conclusions to be drawn from them, that within a century, perhaps within half that period, there will be a dissolution of the United States, a bloodless partition of this great continent, and the formation, as one result, of four strong confederations—the East with its capital and its commerce; the South with its sugar, its cotton, its tobacco, and its seaports; a West with its mines and the Pacific Ocean; and a Central division, composed of agricultural communities, to be the hub of the continent, but at the mercy of all the rest—and to become the future battle field of the millions of struggling people yet to swarm over the land and to fight for the subsistence which men will deny and which nature may be too exhausted to afford?

The day of absolute freedom for the American Slave is not likely to come until our present political and financial systems are purified as by fire, or until the new continental divisions formed on the ruin of

the old régime, give to a later world modernized forms of government, sovereignties cleansed of political tricksters and the spoilage carrion that breeds them, with capital restricted in its vulgar tyranny, and a harmonious working of what are now discordant elements. The American Slave of the year 1900 will not have his kind in the year 2000. If in that year there are governments, they will be the governments either of men absolutely free or absolutely slaves.

THE END.



